School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1373760

Methodist
Historical Society

Southern California-Arizona
Conference



Presented by

Rev. Eustace Anderson



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

BT
1031
PCo

A

HIGHER CATECHISM

OF

THEOLOGY.

BY

WILLIAM BURT POPE, D.D.,

Theological Tutor, Didsbury College, Manchester.

NEW YORK:
PHILLIPS & HUNT.
CINCINNATI:
CRANSTON & STOWE.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

I. THEOLOGY 1
II. CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY 5
III. THEOLOGY IN THE CHURCH 7
IV. THE SCIENCE OF THEOLOGY 11

BOOK I.

THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION AND THE RULE OF FAITH.

CHAPTER I.
REVELATION AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH 17

CHAPTER II.
THE CREDENTIALS OR EVIDENCES OF THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION 26

CHAPTER III.
THE INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE 49

CHAPTER IV.
THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE 59

CHAPTER V.
THE CANON AS RULE OF FAITH 64

HISTORICAL LIBRARY

BOOK II.

GOD.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

THE TRIUNE GOD 70

CHAPTER II.

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD 76

CHAPTER III.

HISTORICAL THEORIES AND DISCUSSIONS 85

BOOK III.

GOD AND THE CREATURE.

CHAPTER I.

CREATION 95

CHAPTER II.

THE CREATED UNIVERSE 99

CHAPTER III.

PROVIDENCE 106

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORICAL DISCUSSIONS 110

BOOK IV.

SIN.

CHAPTER I.

SIN, GUILT, PUNISHMENT 115

CHAPTER II.

ORIGINAL SIN 122

BOOK V.

THE MEDIATORIAL WORK OF THE REDEEMER.

CHAPTER I. PAGE
THE REDEEMING PURPOSE OF THE TRIUNE GOD 146

CHAPTER II.
THE PERSON OF CHRIST 155

CHAPTER III.
THE HISTORICAL CHRIST, OR THE PROCESS OF THE MEDIATORIAL WORK 163

CHAPTER IV.
THE FINISHED ATONEMENT 181

BOOK VI.

THE APPLICATION OF REDEMPTION.

CHAPTER I.
THE HOLY SPIRIT AS ADMINISTRATOR 196

CHAPTER II.
VOCATION, OR THE CALLING OF THE SPIRIT 202

CHAPTER III.
PREVENIENT GRACE AND THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION 207

CHAPTER IV.
THE ESTATE OF GRACE, OR PERSONAL SALVATION 222

CHAPTER V.
THE PROBATION OF THE GOSPEL 276

CHAPTER VI.
CHRISTIAN MORALS; OR THE ETHICS OF REDEMPTION 292

CHAPTER VII.
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH 322

BOOK VII.

THE LAST THINGS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE 360

CHAPTER II.

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST: RESURRECTION AND JUDGMENT . 367

CHAPTER III.

THE CONSUMMATION, OR END OF ALL THINGS 386

Introduction.

I. THEOLOGY.

II. CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

III. THEOLOGY IN THE CHURCH.

IV. THE SCIENCE OF THEOLOGY.

INTRODUCTION.

1. What is Christian theology?

The science of God and Divine things or religion, as based upon the revelation made to mankind in Jesus Christ and systematised within the Christian Church.

2. What is embraced by this definition?

(1) Generally, the entire encyclopædia of theological sciences, or the whole sum of the literature of Christianity, is comprehended in it.

(2) But it is particularly limited to that which treats of the faith, practice, and worship of the fellowship founded by our Lord.

3. How may we distribute the subject by way of introduction?

By considering the main principles (1) of theology and religion; (2) of Christian theology and religion as such; and (3) of their scientific exposition in the church.

§ 1. Theology and Religion.

1. What is theology proper?

The doctrine concerning God. Theology is from the Greek; the term divinity, from the Latin (Divinus), includes more generally all Divine things.

2. In what sense does this word embrace all?

Because there is nothing in man's knowledge concerning himself or the universe which is not related to God; and, more particularly, because God is the great and leading object in every department of theological literature.

3. What does the doctrine concerning God presuppose in man?

A faculty for the reception of that knowledge of Himself which God imparts; or the capacity of religion.

4. What is religion?

(1) It is strictly the bond (religere) which, in the very constitution of his nature, unites man to God: faith THAT HE IS, and consciousness of dependence and obligation. Heb. xi. 6. (2) More widely, it is the form in which the religious sentiment finds expression in worship and duty and fellowship.

5. How are the terms religion and theology connected?

(1) On the one hand, religion is wider than theology. The former is the posture of the whole man towards God; the latter has to do with the inquiries and judgments of his mind only. (2) On the other hand, theology is much wider than religion; as the latter word refers only to human relations, while the former ranges over the relations of all things to God. But (3) their influence on each other is important: man's religion takes its character from his theology, and the converse is also true, that as his worship is his creed will be.

6. What is implied in this limitation to man?

(1) That man is in some sense the central object: the relation of all other beings and things is scantily dealt with, but nothing is omitted that vitally concerns the nature and destiny of mankind.

(2) That the teaching concerning God is adapted to human faculties, the Divine method being, as it is called, anthropomorphic: condescending to human terms of speech.

(3) That, therefore, the whole study of theology implies the unspeakable dignity and value of human nature in the sight of God who created man in His own image.

7. Is anything else suggested by the union of these terms?

(1) That God is the sole teacher of the things concerning

Himself: He alone who gave the faculty and instinct can respond to it.

(2) That the essence of theology is the practical knowledge of God, as revealed in His Son through the Spirit.

(3) That the study can be successfully carried on only in the spirit of reverence and devotion. All is concerning God, and comes from God, and leads to God.

8. Where do we look for the supreme evidence that God condescends to teach man both his theology and his religion?

In the Incarnation of the Eternal Son, Who is God teaching man his religion in his own human nature.

§ 2. Christian Theology.

1. State more particularly the relation of theology to Jesus Christ.

He is the supreme teacher both of theology and of religion: they are united in Him.

2. In what sense are they united in Him?

He has revealed God in His own person, making that revelation the centre of all truth; and He has founded on that revelation the Christian religion, which meets all the requirements of man's relations to his Maker.

3. Was there no religion in the world before He came?

There was a natural religion, without express revelation; and a revealed religion among the Jews: both, though in very different senses, preparing for the supreme and final Revealer.

4. What is the relation of Christianity to natural religion?

(1) The best theology of the religion of nature consisted of unwritten principles of truth found in men generally: these the Saviour appealed to and confirmed.

(2) Perversions of these principles took the form of mythology, on the one hand, or philosophy, on the other: the errors of these Christianity condemned and corrected.

(3) Its religions were the great systems of worship found throughout the world, especially in the East: these the religion of Christ came to supersede and abolish.

5. What is the modern Science of Religion?

The study and classification of the various developments of the religious instinct in mankind, conducted without reference to supernatural revelation.

6. What is the relation of Christian theology to this science?

It uses the materials of that science for its own purpose: to show the world's need of one absolute religion. But, while the science of religion begins with man and makes Christianity only one form of the religious instinct, Christian theology begins with God who gives one great revelation through His Son: all other manifestations of truth being indirectly His.

7. How is Christian theology related to Jewish?

Old-Testament theology, Patriarchal, Mosaic and Prophetical, was fulfilled and consummated by the teaching of Christ. Its perversions in Rabbinism or Talmudism are, like the perversions of natural religion, condemned.

8. Where are the elements of this theology deposited?

In the New-Testament Scriptures, which are the records of the establishment of the Christian religion and the documents of the Christian faith.

9. How is Christian theology connected with these elements?

All first principles are intended for application to life; and the Founder of Christianity has left the principles of His theology to be expanded with the growth of His religion and thus to find its large development: in other words, to be unfolded in the congregation of His people.

10. Meanwhile, what obligation does His name impress?

That the study of theology, in its whole compass, shall pay its tribute to the dignity and authority of His person.

§ 3. Theology in the Church.

1. What is the relation of theology to the church?

(1) Generally, it is the whole sum of the literature to which Christianity has given birth.

(2) Particularly, it is the formal arrangement of the methods by which the churches have unfolded, taught, and defended the principles of the Christian faith.

2. What does this presuppose?

(1) That the Scriptures have been committed by our Lord to His people to be the rule of faith and practice for ever.

(2) That He is present by His Spirit and watches over the gradual developments of religious teaching and knowledge.

3. What have been the forms of teaching in the church?

(1) The first, and most universal, is the unfolding of Scripture in the edification of believers. Hence has arisen practical theology: official in the ministerial office, and more general in all devout religious literature.

(2) Catechetical instruction by catechists: preparing catechumens for baptism, adults before and children after. Hence the universal theology of the catechism.

(3) The definitions of the faith as against heresy and stated in dogmas, or authoritative decisions on doctrine. Hence, in its strict meaning, dogmatic theology: the exposition of creeds and confessions of faith.

(4) The defence of the faith against assault has given rise to apologetic theology: Polemics, as conducted within the church; and Apology or Evidences, as directed against external foes. This has been a fruitful branch of Christian literature.

4. What is the difference between creeds and confessions?

Generally speaking, the creeds were the authoritative statements of the faith in the ancient and undivided church; the confessions, or standards, or articles, or formularies, are those of the divided church in its individual communities.

5. Which were the ancient creeds?

(1) The Apostles': a gradual expansion of the baptismal formula. (2) The Nicene : the same, with a clearer definition of the Eternal Sonship. (3) The Athanasian: distinguished by a fuller exposition of the Trinity and the Incarnation.

6. What was the theology of the interval between the creeds and confessions?

It may be termed Mediæval. During the middle ages, darkness and light struggled together. In the East, theology was comparatively stagnant ; in the West, it was actively studied in the Schools or Universities of Europe, whence the term Scholastic theology. This took two forms : one developing the principles which were afterwards consolidated in the final form of Roman Catholicism ; the other more evangelically mystical, and in many ways preparing for the Reformation.

7. What may be called confessional theology?

That which represents the several views of Christian faith held by the divisions of Christendom since the sixteenth century : the dogmatic and polemical testimony and teaching of each communion, viewed in its relation to the others.

8. Name the principal branches of this.

(1) Protestant theology, in general, is the teaching of all communions that separated from the pontifical unity of the Western Church. This was opposed to Roman Catholicism, which, as Tridentine, was itself a protest against Protestantism.

(2) Lutheran or Evangelical, and Reformed or Calvinistic, were the two main forms of European Protestantism : the former being more sacramental in its tendency, the latter more predestinarian, but both fundamentally the same.

(3) Arminian or Remonstrant theology sprang up in Holland as a protest against Predestinarianism.

(4) Socinian teaching had its seat in Poland: based on an unscriptural protest against the distinction of Persons in the Godhead, and gradually descending to modern Unitarianism.

9. Why is confessional theology sometimes called symbolical?

From the term σύμβολον, symbol, the technical term for a creed or formulary of confession.

10. Which are the leading symbols or formularies of faith?

After the Reformation, and as the result of it, the leading communions put forth a succession of formularies and catechisms.

(1) Lutheranism had its chief standard in the Augsburg Confession (1530) and the Catechism of Luther, followed nearly fifty years after by the Formula Concordiæ.

(2) The Reformed or Calvinistic churches set out with the Helvetic Confession (1564) and the Heidelberg Catechism (1563); followed by others in France and Belgium and elsewhere. Presbyterianism, as a branch of the Reformed, issued the Westminster Confession, which, with its modification in the Savoy Confession and others, remains still in some sense the recognised standard of the Presbyterian and Congregational bodies in England and America.

(3) Anglicanism had its main standard in the Thirty-nine Articles; combining the chief elements of the two former.

(4) Arminianism, which sprang up in Holland as a protest against Calvinism, issued a Remonstrant Confession (1620), specially in Five Articles of difference; this, however, is not a living formulary, nor is Arminianism a distinct body.

(5) The Society of Friends acknowledges no human standard; but Barclay's Apology is of the nature of a confession of faith.

(6) Methodism has issued no formal and general confession. It holds for the most part the three creeds, and the doctrinal formulary of the English Church; but its standards are found more particularly in certain writings of the Founder of the Society. American Methodism aims at a more distinct confession.

(7) The old Socinian system has also lost its hold: modern Unitarianism having taken its place; but with a very much lower teaching as to the person of Christ, His communion with the Father in heaven, and His lordship over all.

(8) The old communions of East and West had also their

new confessions: the Tridentine decrees and the Catechism of Pius V. were the definitive doctrine of Rome, supplemented in the present age by the Vatican decisions of 1854 and 1870; the Greek Church has held to the first creeds, but with several modern confessions added.

11. Is a Catholic theology to be traced through all these?

From the time that the Christian church began the development of scriptural teaching there has been an unfailing witness to the fundamental verities of the gospel: a catholic theology, in the truest sense, which no errors in any community or in the darkest age have entirely concealed.

12. What is meant here by development?

Development has two ideas in it: the laying open what is already behind, and the letting a germ grow which was waiting for its time. In both senses the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has been developed in the dogmatic teaching of the churches: the latter however not without peril.

13. How then are doctrine and dogma related?

Strictly speaking, doctrine is only of God and dogma is the fixed opinion of man. But in general usage doctrine is the current of teaching and dogma the established expression of it in formulas ecclesiastical.

14. What general principles have guided the development, as thus defined?

Certain marked tendencies are discernible in the history of the church.

(1) Patristic theology (down to A.D. 600) was divided into two branches: one more faithful to the letter of Scripture, and another more philosophical, mystical, and speculative. These two have been more or less permanent down to the present.

(2) A tendency to corrupt the simplicity of the faith in the interest of a false theory of the unity of the church, joined to the notion of an infallible traditional interpretation, has

moulded the development of the greater mass of Christian theology: the influence that has reigned most extensively.

(3) A mystical tendency has illumined theology from the beginning: partly with a false, and partly with a true, light. This has not been limited to any one section, nor has it been excluded from any. No element has been more pervasive.

(4) The Latitudinarian or Eclectic spirit has affected theological teaching, especially in the earlier and the later periods of the history of Christianity. Its principle is indifference to dogmatic statements or decisions.

(5) Rationalism in all ages, but especially in the last, has played its part. Its spirit is jealous distrust of pure faith and undue homage to pure reason in the acceptance of all the truths professedly revealed.

15. What may be hoped for the future?

That all communions will be brought nearer and nearer to *the unity of the faith:* of which there are not wanting many signs. It is the duty of every theologian to help forward this. Eph. iv. 13.

16. Meanwhile what is the duty of the student?

To study theology historically as represented by all communions: for without this he cannot make sure advancement towards that catholic unity. But, at the same time, to hold fast the confession which he believes that Providence has given him, and with humble confidence to study the whole round of theology by its light. In all and above all, he must make the Scriptures his principle, his guide, and his final appeal.

§ 4. The Science of Theology.

1. What claim has theology to be called a science?

Science is the logical arrangement of certified truth; and by every test theology makes good its claim to be this.

2. In what sense is it certified truth?

Truth theological is the conformity of our knowledge with the realities of God and the invisible world. Its certitude is

the faith that receives and trusts in the witness given to these by God Himself.

3. But is not the certitude of science as such determined by reason?

In laying the foundations of all science reason is or must become faith: the primary principles of knowledge are indestructible beliefs; which are certitudes, though not demonstrable by reason as distinguished from faith.

4. What is the theological relation of reason and faith?

While philosophy merges faith into reason, theology keeps them distinct: faith is the proof of things not seen; reason accepts the proof, and logically forms all the materials of this knowledge into ordered and systematic science.

5. Where are the materials of this science gathered?

In every region: in the consciousness of man; in the external universe; in the books of revelation; in the common experiences of mankind.

6. Does not this make theology a universal science?

Such it is, in a sense appropriate to no other. But in theology the science is subordinate to the practical art: all true science has its application to human interests, but this holds good especially of theology in relation to ethics.

7. What is its specific relation to other sciences?

The sciences of being and knowing, Ontology, Metaphysics and Philosophy proper, are all really occupied with one branch of theology: God and the relation of the universe to Him. Psychology, with all the inquiries that deal with man as soul and body, cannot be truly studied apart from our science. The Physical sciences, as such, are less directly connected with it; but their value as the study of phenomena and laws is to be estimated by the tribute they pay or fail to pay to the Supreme Author of the universe and its laws.

8. How do we understand the logical order of our science?

(1) Theology uses the rules by which facts are made science: induction, the reasoning process that gathers up particulars into generals; and deduction, that carries a general truth into its many applications. By the former, generally speaking, the definitions of theological dogma are reached; the latter more particularly governs theological ethics.

(2) The result is systematic theology, which is the orderly presentation of the entire subject in all its branches, with the relation of these branches to each other.

9. What are the branches of systematic theology?

They are mainly three:

(1) Biblical theology, which investigates and defends the Scriptures, and exhibits their various teachings systematically.

(2) Historical, which connects theology with its developments in ecclesiastical usages and controversies.

(3) Dogmatic, which analyses and combines the result in formal doctrine regarded as authoritative.

10. How do these enter into a course of theological study?

They may be regarded as entirely distinct, and presented accordingly. Or they may be taken coordinately: the scriptural principles of doctrine may be laid down, then the historical controversies concerning it, and the dogmatic statement as finally accepted. But the simpler method, followed in this course, is to combine the biblical and dogmatic; adding, where necessary, an historical review.

11. What principles generally govern the order?

Sometimes the Articles of the Creed, sometimes points in a Confession, are made the foundation of a system: but this tends to a contracted scheme. Or the whole course may be divided into the evidences, doctrines, morals, and institutions of Christianity: with this disadvantage, however, that the last two are apt to be severed from the second. Our method will gather the whole into unity, by taking: (1) Revelation, he

Scriptures, and the Rule of Faith ; (2) the Doctrine of God ; (3) the Creature, Creation, and Providence ; (4) Sin ; (5) the Mediatorial Work of the Redeemer ; (6) its Administration by the Spirit in the Church of Christ ; and (7) the Last Things.

12. Finally, under what rules and safeguards must theological study be conducted ?

It must always be remembered :

(1) That accurate system is here of great importance : the student has a great advantage who always surveys the bearings and connections of his subjeet ; and no outcries against dogma, from any quarter, should be listened to for a moment.

(2) That the terms of theology, conventionally established, should be fixed and held sacred in their meaning : for instance, such words as inspiration, substance, person, must have and should always retain their own sense in this science.

(3) That mysteries are to be expected, accepted and gloried in : all revelation unfolds a mystery, in the theological sense of a secret revealed ; and every doctrine is surrounded by mystery in the more common meaning of the word.

(4) That the unity of the whole is the presence of the Word in the word : the Scriptures being the supreme guide.

(5) That the Holy Spirit is the Sole Interpreter ; and that He will guide those who submit to be led by Him into the

BOOK I.

The Christian Revelation and the Rule of Faith.

I. REVELATION AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

II. THE CREDENTIALS OR EVIDENCES OF REVELATION.

III. THE SCRIPTURES OF INSPIRATION.

IV. THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

V. THE DIVINE RULE OF FAITH.

BOOK I.

The Christian Revelation and the Rule of Faith.

Preliminary.

1. On what grounds do we begin thus?

(1) All the topics of theology presuppose a revelation of God to man, which we hold to have been perfected in Christianity; (2) this is witnessed by its credentials for faith, and its evidences to reason; (3) Christianity itself is to us based upon its inspired documents; (4) these are contained in the canonical Scriptures; and (5) therefore the canon of Scripture is to us the Divine Rule of Faith.

2. State this in one definition.

Christianity is the supreme revelation, infallible in its credentials, bound up with written documents which are to the Christian Church the canonical and Divine rule of faith.

Chapter I.

Revelation and the Christian Faith.

§ 1. Revelation.

1. What is the meaning of this word in Scripture?

It is expressed generally by two leading terms: ἀποκάλυψις, which is the Divine unfolding of what lay hid; and φανέρωσις, which is the manifestation to human knowledge.

2. Are those terms used with different applications?

(1) The latter, manifestation, is so applied as to cover all revelation: that which is natural and that which is supernatural. (2) The former, revelation proper, will be found, when examined, to be used only of the supernatural order.

3. How is the distinction of natural and supernatural established?

(1) We read everywhere in Scripture of a universal revelation in nature. *That which may be known of God is manifest*, and in the framework of the universe *the invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen: His everlasting power* is as it were *perceived*, and His *Divinity* inferred as behind it.

Rom. i. 19, 20.

(2) But in connection with this, we read also of a special revelation over and above that which is general: a light shining above the light of the sun in nature, in Him *Who was manifested in the flesh*, and which also is clearly seen *according to the revelation of the mystery.*

1 Tim. iii. 16. Rom. xvi. 25.

4. What is the relation between the two?

(1) The former, or natural revelation, is the ground of the latter: first the Son *lighteth every man;* and then, as *coming into the world*, He specially unveils the Godhead to whomsoever He *willeth to reveal Him.*

John i. 9

(2) Its deficiencies also are the reason for it. *The world through its wisdom knew not God;* and then it was His will to send the Redeemer *Who was made unto us wisdom from God.*

Matt. xi. 27. 1 Cor. i. 21, 30.

5. Why do we limit the term revelation to the supernatural?

(1) Because in Scripture it is always so limited. Every use of the term Apocalypse points to the higher manifestations. Even those applications which seem to be less important have to do with redemption: such as *I went up by revelation*, which has some connection with the pleasure of God *to reveal His Son* in the Apostle.

Gal. ii. 2. Gal. i. 16.

(2) Because the objects or subjects of this revelation are of so transcendent a nature that we appropriate the word to them: when the sun is risen there can be no other light.

6. Thus limited, then, what further distinction must we necessarily make?

Supernatural revelation is either objective, what is revealed TO the receiver; or subjective, how it is revealed IN man.

7. What are the main objects of this revelation?

(1) Supremely, the being of God and man's true relations to Him: the Divinity manifest in nature becomes the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

(2) The great mystery of Christ and human redemption: the secret *kept in silence through times eternal.* Rom. xvi. 25.

(3) The nature of religion and its eternal issues.

8. What is revelation as in man or subjective?

(1) It is direct or immediate: as to the sacred organs of the heavenly communications. And to them direct, in external or internal visions, by the Voice from heaven, and in secret suggestions of the Divine Mind to the human.

(2) It is mediate: through those who received it from God to those who receive it at their hands.

(3) It is also, combining these, once more direct to those who embrace their testimony, through an internal and immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit.

9. Then, in every sense, revelation is one and Divine?

(1) It is Divine: for man cannot originate truth, or the knowledge of anything external, in his own mind.

(2) It is one: for the great outline and every subordinate detail of revelation point to the supreme revelation in Christ.

(3) Hence we understand what is meant by Divine Revelation absolutely; and that as consummated in the Christian faith, to which we now turn.

§ 2. Revelation in Christ, or the Christian Faith.

1. What is the relation of these phrases?

The sum of all revelation is really the mystery of Christ, of God manifested in His Son, who is Himself the revelation and the revealer of it.

2. Explain these two more particularly.

(1) In His person, God and Man, Christ is the sum and substance of all revelation: THE TRUTH. John xiv. 6.

(2) In His teaching, our Lord gives us all truth: making all former and lower revelations His own by taking them up into His personal communications, and by adding all that is necessary for man as a probationary creature.

3. But is not the Christian revelation more properly a branch of general revelation?

There have been many revelations, but to us there is only one. Divine revelation is no other than Christianity or the Christian Faith.

4. What is the precise force of this last phrase?

It signifies that the teaching of Christ is made up of *things most surely believed* by Christians, or *fully established;* that it is not a Christian philosophy, which may be the ground of speculation; nor a mere historical record of events.

Luke i. 1.

5. But surely it is accepted as a historical record?

It is so: but that does not fully explain the Christian FAITH, in the fulness of the meaning of that word.

6. What then is the faith to which this revelation in Christ is addressed?

It is threefold: the principle or faculty in human nature which apprehends the invisible; that which receives facts on adequate testimony; and finally that which appropriates and trusts in the object revealed. These in their unity are appealed to by Christian revelation and accept it.

7. But may not the last of these be wanting in an acceptance of Christianity?

This is a difficult question: as the revelation of nature was held in unrighteousness, so also may supernatural revelation. But the question may be answered by a distinction between the Christian faith as objective and as subjective.

8. Illustrate that distinction.

(1) Sometimes in the New Testament we read of *the*

faith which was ONCE FOR ALL *delivered unto the saints:* this may be accepted and even be hereditarily transmitted. Jude 3.

(2) But generally the faith is regarded as an internal principle in virtue of which the believer says *Jesus is Lord.* 1 Cor. xii. 3.

(3) The union of these is a perfect acceptance of Divine revelation. The truth becomes *Your most holy faith.* Jude 20.

§ 3. Rebelation and the Bible.

1. What is meant by combining these terms?

That all revelation, in its highest sense, is contained in the Holy Scriptures, which therefore have been generally and rightly spoken of by metonymy as a Divine revelation.

2. Does this imply that every part of the Bible is immediate and proper revelation?

By no means: the greater part is not of that character. But there is no part of it which is not directly or indirectly connected with one great historical scheme.

3. What is meant by Historical Revelation?

This expression unites revelation with Christ, and indicates the progress of truth toward Him its End; it also includes the methods by which revelation has been made permanent in documents and in institutions.

4. As applied to the documents, what is the difference between revelation and inspiration?

(1) In its highest department revelation coincides with inspiration; (2) but, generally, revelation is the result as a whole, inspiration the means; and (3) inspiration is conventionally used to signify the Spirit's agency in providing for the permanence of revelation in Holy Scripture.

§ 4. Historical.

1. What controversies have arisen on these subjects?

Three classes: (1) as to the possibility of any revelation; (2) as to the necessity of a supernatural revelation; and (3),

granting such a revelation, the relation of reason to faith as it respects its acceptance.

2. Who represent the first class?

Only the Atheist and the Pantheist and the Materialist. If there is a God, personal and distinct from man, then the very acceptance of this truth means revelation: for it is an idea given to the mind, whether as innate or as subsequently imparted. And that again renders all further revelation possible.

3. But if it is said that there can be no distinction between the mind's consciousness and revelation from without?

Then we must reply that the very consciousness is a revelation from without: there is no knowledge of things seen but through Him who is *the light of the world.* John ix. 5. Then the same is true of things not seen. But it is enough to say that as man, the image of God, can act upon the mind of his fellow, the infinite Mind can act upon all as He will.

4. Who represent the second class?

Those who admit that all religion is taught of God, but think that it is taught only and sufficiently by the light of nature. To them nature is not the corrected but the corrector.

5. How are these divided amongst themselves?

They have the common name of Theists, believers in God: Deists is the name given more particularly to the English advocates of the religion of nature in the last century. Uniting in the rejection of supernatural revelation, they part in two lines: those who respect the Scriptures as the highest form of natural religion, and those who reject them as a corruption of that natural religion.

6. What ground do the former take?

They regard the phenomena of the religious instinct in mankind as an object of science, the Science of Religion or Comparative Theology; and classify the races of men according to their religious beliefs and practices. Religions have

their founders, among whom Moses is first and Jesus Christ the last but one; their sacred books, among which the Jewish and Christian are placed as in a polyglot; and their various usages, adapted to their various circumstances and characters.

7. What is our argument against this science?

(1) The negative one, which shows by a comparison of these religions with that of the Bible that a supernatural religion was necessary for their correction.

(2) The positive one, that if the Revealer is the Son of God there can be but one religion, absolute and eternal.

8. But is not this arguing in a circle?

Yes: on our part as on theirs. The Theist begs the question of God's existence; Christianity begs the question as to its Divine Head and His necessary supremacy.

9. What ground do the latter class take?

That all the good in Biblical revelation is only a republication of the religion of nature; that what it brings over and above is to be rejected of human reason.

10. How is this to be met?

(1) By admitting that supernatural revelation is based on the natural, confirms all its great principles, and honours it throughout: reasserting its beliefs and in its own terms.

(2) By proving from its own records and history that natural religion has utterly failed in the first obligations of all religion; and has nowhere tended to improvement.

(3) By urging that, a Ruler of the universe being granted, it might be expected He would interpose from the beginning to correct this failure.

(4) By showing that supernatural religion at all points professes to bring that correction and does actually bring it: as will be seen in the next chapter.

(5) By appealing to the instincts of natural religion which in its sense of sin, and craving after propitiation, and philo-

sophical discipline of morals, anticipated the very answers which the New Testament gives.

11. Does this reasoning exhaust the attack of natural religion and our defence?

It does not; there are two arguments of much force that it uses: one is derived from the transcendent nature of some of the new truths of the Bible; and another from the delay of supernatural religion in coming and the slowness of its diffusion after having come.

12. How may we meet these two grave difficulties?

The former belongs to the credentials of Christianity, and we may postpone it to the next chapter: premising here that the religion of nature has accepted wonder piled on wonder, and ought not after its experience to shrink from anything not contradictory to reason.

13. But as to the slow development of the Divine counsel in supernatural revelation?

That is a deep mystery: but the very word mystery, as interpreted by evolution, ought to plead as an apology. Natural religion believes in a God whom, in these its last days at least, it supposes to have developed His plans with infinite patience through unlimited ages. Surely it cannot consistently reject supernatural revelation on the ground of its being a secular evolution of spiritual forces which are gradually suppressing all rivals, and showing themselves to be the best by surviving all others.

14. The word evolution suggests another thought: may not what is called supernatural revelation be a natural evolution of natural religion?

By the very terms natural and supernatural are as distinct as finite and infinite. Moreover, there are some truths in the latter part of the Bible which can hardly be said to have their germs in natural religion. But, finally and chiefly, our supernatural religion, as such, stands or falls with its claim to

have come from above and not to have been developed from below. There can be no reconciliation with evolution.

15. Are not the principles of natural religion as much contradicted by evolution as those of supernatural religion?

Assuredly they are. Natural theology and natural religion are based on the foundation of the existence of God, of the creation of man, of moral responsibility, and therefore of man's spiritual nature. All these it holds in common with supernatural revelation. But the tendency of modern evolution is to make all religious ideas and spiritual emotions and judgments of conscience the final result—so far as anything can be final—of developments, the processes of which we see at their various stages in the creatures below us.

16. But does not the slowness of revelation after all form a great obstacle to its ready acceptance?

Undoubtedly it does. We may use the argument of analogy as against the evolutionist adversary; but the argument is only defensive. The slow unfolding of the purposes of God is and must ever be an unsearchable mystery.

17. A third kind of controversy was mentioned, as to the claims of reason as the judge and interpreter of revelation?

Of this it may be said, generally, that a supernatural revelation judged by reason is a contradiction in terms. On the other hand, that a Divine revelation could not be interpreted by reason would be equally a contradiction. But the question comes up in its fit place under the Rule of Faith.

Chapter II.

The Credentials or Evidences of the Christian Revelation.

§ 1. Preliminary.

1. Is there any difference between credentials and evidences?

There is no essential difference. But the term credentials rather suggests: (1) the internal character of revelation as commending itself to the faith and acceptance of men; (2) the Divine attestations given to the organs and documents of the Faith; thus (3) the credentials are from within and the evidences are both from within and from without.

2. What is here meant by the Faith?

The Faith, the Christian Faith, Divine Revelation, we must regard as meaning the same thing. The first is the New-Testament term for the Christian revelation. It is addressed to faith subjective; those who receive it are called believers; and that which they receive is called their faith objectively: their *most holy faith.*

Jude 20.

3. How are men classed in relation to these evidences?

(1) In the New Testament we read generally of believers and unbelievers: doubters are mentioned only in the Gospels.

(2) In modern times, unbelievers are subdivided as infidels or disbelievers; sceptics, who willingly, or doubters who unwillingly, remain in suspense; and agnostics, who have devised this name to express not the fact of their ignorance, but the impossibility of knowing anything outside of nature.

4. What names are given to evidences in revelation itself?

Generally, they are signs or witnesses, from God; proofs or demonstration, as of the doctrines; seals, to the mind receiving them as fully assured.

5. What do we gather from this?

That the evidences are regarded as necessary and sufficient to make unbelief inexcusable.

6. And what are we taught as to the true though secret character of unbelief itself?

That *the god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving:* they have an *evil heart of unbelief,* and are *reprobate concerning the faith.* Unbelief is usually connected with moral depravity. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Heb. iii. 12. 1 Tim. iii. 8.

7. How does this affect the value of the evidences?

It should lead us not to expect too much from them, as apart from the moral influence of the Holy Spirit.

8. How may the evidences of Christianity be best studied?

(1) They may be exhibited as internal and external: internal, from the character of the revelation itself; external as brought from history without. But, strictly speaking, these cannot be separated; since most of the external evidences are only confirmation of the internal.

(2) The evidences are really to be incorporated with the doctrines; and every truth of a fundamental character must have its own credential.

(3) There is a distinct range of evidences which establish the genuineness of the books and institutions of Christianity.

(4) All these run into each other; and every subject in theology must be studied apologetically. Independent works on the evidences collectively have their value; but the best evidences are distributed through the whole course.

9. How do these evidences concern us at our present stage?

Simply as the internal credentials of the Christian faith as such: that is, the irresistible claims it has to our attention.

10. And how may these credentials be arranged?

It may be demonstrated in a cumulative way:

(1) That the Christian revelation is a perfect response to human need and expectation, thus demanding to be heard;

(2) That the Divine Hand is manifest in its whole history from the beginning down to its consummation in Christ;

(3) That the character of Jesus the Revealer is the supreme and all-sufficient credential of its claims;

(4) That the history and effects of Christianity vindicate its claims as the one permanent and victorious religion; and, finally,

(5) That the Holy Spirit is in the Christian revelation as its ordained, sufficient, and never-failing demonstration.

I.

The Perfect Response to Human Expectation.

1. What is the bearing of this credential?

The Christian revelation alone answers the deepest and most universal inquiries of human nature about spiritual realities, and the connection between time and eternity.

2. Does the Christian religion itself make this claim?

Directly or indirectly it professes everywhere to teach man all that he can know of himself, of his God, of his redemption, of his duty, and of his way to heaven: that is, to respond to every instinctive demand of the human heart. And that claim it justifies: no question being unanswered, for good or evil.

3. But can it be said that Christianity alone does this?

Yes, alone: for (1) many great truths were never revealed till Christ revealed them; (2) those which were known before were only partially known; and (3) even that partial knowledge was mingled everywhere with corruptions.

4. Then this credential implies a revelation gradually and very slowly perfected?

The Christian faith has this for its fundamental principle.

5. What is the force of this credential?

Its strength rests on these impregnable principles:

(1) That the Author of human nature intended this universal instinct, like every other, to be gratified; (2) that nowhere save in Christianity is there even a profession to offer this satisfaction; (3) that in the religion of Jesus there is a response to the inquiry of man individually and of mankind on every possible subject that concerns our destiny in time and eternity; and therefore (4) that it demands even on these accounts to be solemnly considered.

6. Do these last words go far enough?

Not for the Christian himself. But as an argument for Christianity it is sufficient that it establishes a strong claim for acceptance: he who turns away does it at a fearful peril.

Its Vindication.

7. What arguments are brought against this credential?

Two classes: (1) those which assert that the religious expectation of the race is sufficiently answered by all religions, Christianity being only one of them; and (2) those which deny that the revelation of Jesus responds truly to the religious inquiries of mankind, and therefore reject it at once.

8. What is common to these, and what peculiar to each?

(1) They agree in refusing to Christianity the place of a sole and absolute religion, uniting in opposition to its exclusiveness. As to the Christian faith they are one in Infidelity.

(2) They differ, inasmuch as the former gives the Christian system a high place in the development of universal religion, though regarding it as containing, like all others, corruptions of primitive religious ideas; while the latter holds Christianity to be a superstition contradictory to the truer natural religion.

9. Is Christianity rejected by both as being supernatural?

Strictly speaking, it is so: the modern science of religion regards the religious instinct, or the faculty for the Infinite, as taking a wide variety of forms; and indeed makes that variety the deepest secret of race distinction. Hence it thinks that no

single religion can give that one universal response which is adapted to all races of men alike.

10 How does our credential meet this?

By firmly maintaining that there must be one absolute religion; and by insisting on the great gulf that is fixed between the highest development of any natural religion and the first elements of Divine revelation or the Christian faith.

11. Does not the science of religion admit this superiority?

No: it holds that the specific doctrines of Christianity—such as the incarnation, the atonement, and the future destiny of men—are morbid developments of germs in other religions. Rejecting these doctrines, it holds nevertheless that the ethics of Christianity are on the whole the highest.

12. What is the tendency of modern infidelity as avowed opposition to the Christian faith?

It is rapidly drifting toward the denial of our spiritual nature and immortality. The infidelity of Positivism holds that man's spiritual instincts are accidents of his nature, which he invents a religion to respond to. Agnosticism wraps both the inquiry and the response in a cloud of darkness. Hence with these our credential has necessarily no force.

13. But the credential has its force against them?

Yes: for the universal appeal to the supernatural cannot be suppressed. Modern Theism is a protest in defence of it. But Theism, like the Deism of the last century, denies to Jesus supreme authority; and this is its weakness as a protest. God does not answer the cries of humanity save by His Incarnate Son: mere nature cannot teach or save nature.

II.

The Hand of God in Christian Revelation.

1. What is meant by this credential?

That throughout the whole course of revelation, as per-

fected in Christ and the documents of the Christian Faith, there are manifest proofs of the Divine presence in the supernatural order: of God's power in miracles; of His knowledge in prophecy; and of His wisdom in the unity of the whole revelation. This last is important as the complement of the others.

2. How does the supernatural order cover all this?

A power above phenomenal nature has been always operating among men, the occasional tokens of which we call miracles; a guidance above the light of human reason has been always present, the manifestations of which we call prophecy; and both have been fixed and rendered permanent in human affairs by the documents of revelation as consummated in the Christian faith. The last is only another form of the others.

3. What is the force of this credential?

To those who yield to the preliminary demand of the first, it comes as an irresistible confirmation.

§ 1. Miracle.

1. What is the meaning of miracle as a credential?

(1) It signifies any act of God which is distinguished from those ordinary Divine operations the laws of which we know; and (2) it signifies any act of God which is performed for the sake of confirming His word. Miracle in both senses is bound up with the entire fabric of revelation.

2. How are these two meanings related?

The former, known as powers, δυναμεῖς, or works ἔργα, or wonderful things, μεγαλεῖα, are generally the substance of revelation itself. The latter, σημεῖα, are, so far as distinguished from the former, the occasional tokens by which it pleases God to excite and encourage human faith.

3. How may we illustrate from the Scriptures the distinction thus attempted?

The two highest instances may suffice. The incarnation of the Son of God was the supreme miracle, and itself revela-

tion ; the sign was the miraculous conception. The gift of the Spirit and His influence were the wonderful works of God, and the revelation itself ; the speaking with tongues was the miracle as sign. But illustrations are found in the entire series of the older and later records.

Its Vindication.

4. What may be urged against this credential?

(1) Objections are taken to the possibility of miracle generally ; (2) the general evidence of miracles may be impeached ; (3) the character of some special miracles is turned to the disparagement of all ; (4) the testimony of the New Testament is sometimes quoted against the validity of this evidence ; (5) extra-Biblical miracles, and wonders performed by other than Divine power, are brought in as arguments which can hardly be meant to do more than excite prejudice.

5. How may we meet the first?

By simply asserting that, if God is, He may do whatsoever He will. It cannot be proved that He has in any way bound Himself to what are called natural laws.

6. What may be said as to the general evidence of miracles?

That they are, like other events, matter of testimony. The Biblical miracles were accepted by those who witnessed them on the evidence of their senses ; and they are accepted by after generations on historical evidence sufficient to command credence : being worthy of all acceptation, whether regard be had to the character of the reporters or to the dignity of the performers or to the reasons for which they were performed.

7. Has the third objection any force?

No : for the few miracles which seem unworthy of the Divine intervention really convey important lessons as to the power and special providence of God : indeed, not a miracle recorded fails itself to teach as well as to vindicate the teacher. This applies both to the wonder which is thought to be too great and to that which is thought to be too little.

Josh. x. 13.
2 Kings vi. 6.

8. But does not the Bible in some sense disparage miracles?

There are two errors to be avoided here:

(1) It is true that the signs are disparaged in comparison of the thing signified. Hence the phenomenal miracles comparatively ceased after the permanent miracle of the resurrection of Christ and the Holy Spirit's abiding presence.

(2) Undue dependence on miracles is deprecated: *Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will in no wise believe!* John iv. 48; xx. 29; ii. 23, 24.

(3) But, while revelation in Christ was in process, every great crisis was attended by miracles: the patriarchal times, the Mosaic institute, the restoration under Elijah, the captivity, the advent and life and resurrection of Jesus, the Pentecostal establishment of the church, the minor pentecosts, the heralding of the Gospel by the apostles, all illustrate and exalt the special design of miraculous interventions.

9. How do the miracles not bound up with revelation affect the question?

(1) The portents performed—if indeed performed—by the permission of God were indirectly His own.

(2) Miracles alleged in times following the consummation of the faith must stand or fall by their evidence: there is no law or prophecy of revelation which they necessarily contradict.

§ 2. Prophecy.

1. What is the meaning of prophecy as a credential?

(1) It signifies the method of the Divine announcement by special inspired agents; (2) the prediction by these agents of the coming accomplishment of the Divine purposes. In both these senses prophecy is an essential and pervasive element of revelation: but neither without the other.

2. In what sense pervasive as to the former?

God has never spoken from heaven to man but through men of whom it is said that He *put His Spirit upon them:* this is true of all from Moses to our Lord. Here the word prophet means one who announces or speaks before others. Numb. xi. 29.

3. What then were the prophet's own credentials?

Such tokens of the Divine Spirit with him and of the divinity of his message as were sufficient for those who heard: as in the case of the workers of miracles we must judge of both by the records of their ministry.

Deut. xviii. 23.
John vii. 18.

4. In what sense pervasive as to the latter?

From the first prediction *It shall bruise thy head* down to the last *I come quickly*, it has pleased God to predict the coming future; and through the events of immediately coming times to predict the events of times more distant.

Gen. iii. 15.
Rev. xxii. 20.

5. What are the main laws of prophetic prediction?

(1) The coming Christ is its central subject and object: directly or indirectly all prophetic announcement tends to Him.

(2) There is prophecy of His first coming; followed by prophecy of His second coming: dividing the ages into two parts.

(3) In the subordinate prophecies the outlines of all the future are more or less vividly sketched.

(4) Every prophetic stage is folded in reserve, more or less, until the accomplishment brings in its light.

(5) All prophecies, like all miracles, have been at the same time vehicles of general instruction.

6. What is the general character of this credential?

While the evidential force of the miracle has been felt by the then present generation, that of the prophecy is mainly for the generation that witnesses the accomplishment.

7. Were not prophecy and miracle blended as credentials?

(1) The prophets sometimes wrought miracles both to authenticate and to illustrate their messages.

(2) Their prophetic inspiration was itself a miracle.

(3) Miracle and prophecy run together through all the history of revelation until the church was founded, and then both gradually cease together.

8. Have they then ceased?

At the time of the end miracle will wind up the history of the world as the last and greatest accomplishment of prophecy.

Its Vindication.

9. What are the tests of this credential?

Prophetic prediction must be proved to have been Divine and not the result of human foresight; to have been accomplished only by Divine power; and of course to have been uttered before the event.

10. Will all the predictions of revelation sustain these tests?

So far as we are capable of applying them they will. In some cases the limited resources of history forbid. But in all that concerns the established Christian revelation there remains no shadow of doubt.

11. How may this be illustrated?

(1) The prophetic Form of the coming Messiah, drawn by many pens during a thousand years, and the dispersion of the ancient people predicted in both Testaments, were the prophecies of omniscience; the fulfilment could not have been brought about by human devices; and certainly the predictions were before the event.

(2) The Assyrian conquest of Israel, the ruin of Nineveh, and afterwards of Babylon, the Babylonian captivity, in the Old Testament; the destruction of Jerusalem in the New, are a few out of many other instances which must be studied.

(3) But the credential is one that will be felt in all its force when the entire series of prophecies is examined in the light of their fulfilment.

12. Are not some of the ancient predictions supposed to have been written after the event?

That has always been the contention as it respects Daniel especially. His book is the battle-ground as to both miracle

and prophecy. In modern times, however, the Pentateuch and the Messianic psalms, with most of the other prophetical parts of the Old Testament, are assigned to a very late period.

13. How are these assaults on the credential to be met?

By careful study of the evidence, which, as it satisfied the ancient Jewish and Christian churches, will satisfy us. Meanwhile the Lord Himself has thrown His shield around precisely those books that are most assailed.

§ 3. The Unity of Revelation.

1. What is meant by this credential?

That the unity of revelation as a whole, and of its documents as the record given in many ages by many hands, yields strong concurrent evidence that it comes from God.

2. How may this credential be viewed?

More generally and more particularly. Generally, there is nothing in the world's history that can parallel the sublime oneness and uniqueness of the revelation of God as exhibited in the finished Christian system. Particularly, the agreement of so many authors, writing in various ages and lands, in one great design, and the organic harmony of the one Bible as the result, furnish unlimited illustration of an argument that has the strongest moral force.

3. But is there not another side to this argument?

Yes, it is turned against us by two classes of opponents: those who think the slow development of the great scheme fatal to its divinity; and those who allege the internal differences of the revelation itself.

4. How may we meet the former?

By falling back upon the principle on which Christianity rests: that it is an eternal purpose gradually accomplished. And those who hold fast evolution in every branch of their philosophy should not oppose it here.

5. And how the latter?

By asserting and proving that the apparent discords are harmonised through their unity in Christ: Who is Himself the supreme Apologist of His own religion.

III.

The Supreme Credential: the Founder of Christianity.

1. The Credential Itself.

1. What is meant by this?

That there is no argument, internal or external, in favour of Christianity so powerful as the character of its Founder.

2. Does character here mean excellence simply?

Rather His person, manifestation and life as a whole; but especially the perfect consistency between His claims and Himself. This, however, will include much more.

3. What is the force of this [illegible] credential?

Obviously it is exceedingly strong if it can be proved. Christianity in the person of Jesus makes a transcendent claim: in fact, its most difficult problem is the pretension of its Founder. Now the slightest disparity between His presentation of Himself and that claim would be fatal.

4. Is it enough to show that there is no inconsistency?

No: that is only negative. We should show positively that all we know of Jesus supports His plea. But it is obvious that all we know of Him is but little; and therefore that the strength of our credential lies mainly in the negative demonstration, which however easily passes into the positive.

5. Would not the Lord's consummate moral excellence itself and alone carry all with it?

It does indeed to His own: to them the personal character of Jesus is the sufficient credential for Himself, His doctrine,

and the entire Scriptures. But for the world at large a wider view must be taken: more than merely human excellence being affirmed of the Divine-human Author of Christianity.

6. How then shall we proceed?

By considering His claims, with their credential in the consistency of His character with those claims; and then by establishing the futility of every objection.

§ 2. The Claim of Jesus.

1. How may the Lord's claim be most strongly stated?

By exhibiting it in a few broad antitheses:

(1) He professes to be in His own person God Himself teaching mankind, and yet withal a human teacher.

(2) He comes with a provision for man's universal salvation, which however man must seek for and apply.

(3) He presents Himself as the sinless Son of God, yet as not the less on that account a human example of perfection.

(4) He avowedly purposes to set up a universal kingdom, which however is not to appear till the end of the world.

(5) He makes His departure an essential part of His design, and yet promises His constant presence.

2. Is all this to be included in the claim of Jesus?

All without exception. Neither Christ nor His religion can be either understood or defended if any are omitted.

3. Does our Lord Himself unite these in His appeals?

Only by degrees did either He or His apostles blend them; but in the final gospel which we have to defend they are combined in their unity.

4. Is it not wiser to take lower ground?

Under certain circumstances it might be expedient: it was so, and it may still be so, in the first approaches to the heathen; and, if we are pleading for the Lord's highest place in the science of religion, His supremacy among human

teachers may be insisted on. But the defence of Christianity is the defence of the perfect Christ: IMMANUEL, GOD WITH US. Matt. i. 23.

5. This implies that the advocacy of many theistic and unitarian friends of the Christian faith is declined?

Undoubtedly: while admitting how convincing it is so far as it goes. We do not vindicate a human founder of the faith.

6. But speaking of His claim, consistently maintained, as a credential, how may we simplify these points?

By studying separately and as united the Lord's presentation of Himself as Divine-human; and the perfect sinlessness of His character. These are the two main points.

The Consistency of this Claim.

7. How may this be traced?

It may be said that the whole tenour of our Lord's manifestation can be perfectly explained as in harmony with these claims: with these only, but certainly with these.

8. Does not the very claim by its transcendent uniqueness condemn itself?

It should have the opposite effect: that no one had ever made such a pretension is a most wonderful truth in itself; while the distant anticipation of it both in Judaism and in heathenism brings its sublimity into clearer relief.

9. How is the great claim sustained?

By the wonderful consistency with which our Lord speaks every word as heard of the Father, as having a final authority, and yet as spoken under a commission. He never classes Himself with human teachers; nor indeed with men.

10. But what makes it a credential of Christianity?

That this claim is consistently made by One whose faultless sanctity and perfect selfsacrifice demand our faith in Him. Not to trust Him seems to be self-condemned.

11. But can that perfect character be proved?

It is undoubted that the Lord claims to be exempt from sin. We see Him before us in the lustre of all devotion to God and man. And we are bound to accept His own solution and His evangelist's: beholding in Him the *glory as of the only-begotten from the Father.*

John i. 14.

12. Is the credential then the incarnation or the sinlessness?

These are indissolubly united: the one confirms the other.

13. But supposing both denied?

Then we fall back upon the human excellence, and ask: Could one with the high measure of goodness which all concede to Christ have been capable of such an awful and unparalleled assertion as that the Father was in him, one with him and seen in him as in no other?

John xiv. 10; x. 30; xiv. 9.

14. What is the force of the credential to those who accept it?

It is the credential of all other credentials: giving a heavenly dignity and sanctity to the Gospels; plenary authority to the entire Scriptures as protected and sanctioned by their Lord; and stability to the whole Christian system.

§ 3. The Vindication of this Credential.

1. What is meant by this vindication?

Simply the proving that no hostile hypothesis concerning the Founder of Christianity can be sustained.

2. How may such hypotheses be classified?

By taking historically the forms they have assumed; but this will come in at a later stage when the triumphs of Christianity are before us. At present it is enough to consider the two theories to which all others may be reduced.

3. What are they?

Either Jesus was an enthusiast, and his disciples shared his fanaticism; or he was an impostor, and his followers, whether consciously or unconsciously, entered into his im-

posture. The case may be put in many forms, but it must come at last to this alternative.

4 Must the disciples be bound up so olosely with their Master in this argument?

They cannot be separated. We know nothing or little of Jesus apart from the records of His followers: He made them what they were; and they then made Him what we receive.

5. Has the theory of imposture been ever really maintained?

It was certainly that of His Jewish enemies in the Gospels, and of the malignant foes of Christianity in early centuries. It was revived in the last century; but can hardly be said to survive in the present day.

6. What is its sufficient refutation?

Our Lord's two words gave it once for all: *How can Satan cast out Satan?* and *He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory.* By these two tests, well weighed before application, both Jesus and His disciples are vindicated for ever. The effect He gave in a third word: *Ye both know Me and ye know whence I am!*

Mark iii. 23. John vii. 18. John vii. 28.

7. Where lies the force of this vindication?

Steadfast opposition to all evil, and utter absence of self-ends, were never notes of imposture since the world began.

8. Then the hypothesis of self-deceived enthusiasm remains.

That was unknown in the earliest times, or to the contemporaries of Jesus and His apostles: in the face of their practical simplicity, and the logical coherence of the system they taught, it could not arise. But it has appeared in later times under many forms.

9. How has this affected the estimate of our Lord's personal character?

(1) Some have supposed that he never asserted his sinlessness; but only challenged his foes as a man conscious of high purpose might challenge them.

(2) Some that he consciously fell into unheroic fear of death, and anger against sinners: which however they do not regard as absolutely inconsistent with high integrity.

(3) Others, again, suppose that he began with a pure aim, but gradually yielded to the temptation he once resisted; in which case enthusiasm and imposture joined. This was the argument of the infidels of Europe at the beginning of the century: forced upon them as an expedient of compromise.

10. And what is the defence of our Lord's personal character?

Its entire consistency with His incarnate relation to God and man. His holiness is Divine but in human nature. His severity was that of the ancient Jehovah, and belonged only to God. His struggle with suffering pertained to the mystery of His unshared redeeming passion. His pure and absolute perfection shines through all.

11. What forms do the more special theories assume?

Three: having respect to the Lord Himself, to His disciples, and to the writings of the New Testament. To state these individually is to refute them.

12. How does this apply to our Lord?

We are required by infidelity to believe that he conceived the design to assume the character of the Messiah; that he studied the prophets to that end; formed his plan in the wilderness; gave himself out to be always taught of God; and paid the penalty of his self-deception in death; but left the legacy of his sublime delusion to his followers. It is enough to ask: Can any one read the Gospels and believe this?

13. How to His disciples?

They are supposed to have made their Master their hero; and to have woven around Him as the central figure, or Messianic myth of Jewish hope, the wonderful narratives of the Gospels and Acts. This is sometimes called the Legendary and Mythical theory; and it is swept away by three considerations: the simplicity of these men, first; then their firm

conviction of the Lord's veritable resurrection ; and finally, the heroic sacrifice of their lives for their personal Lord.

14. And how to the writings?

The latest and most laborious effort of unbelief has endeavoured to show that Christianity was simply a sect of Judaism, probably originating from Essenism ; that, after the martyrdom of its founder, it was divided into a straiter Judaic community and one that would abolish the ceremonial law and admit the world : that some of the writings of the New Testament were composed in one interest, some in the other, and some aimed to unite the two tendencies.

15. How does St. Paul appear in this theory?

As really the founder of Christianity : since his teaching transformed Christ from the highest Jewish Rabbi, which he was, into an abolisher of Judaism, which he was not.

16. What is the refutation of it?

(1) The perfect unity of all these writings, when collated in their reference to the Christ.

(2) The testimony of St. Paul himself as to his conversion —an argument of great force in favour of Christianity—and as to his relations with the Lord and the other apostles.

IV.

The Influence and Permanence of Christianity

1. What are the general bearings of this credential?

It supposes the religion of Christ to be in the world, and to plead from age to age its own perfect adaptation to the needs of man, with its accomplishment of its own professed designs as the only saving power among men.

2. Under what laws must we study and interpret it?

We must consider (1) what this religion professes to do ; (2) under what conditions ; and (3) against what opposition.

3. What is its force as a credential?

Taken by itself, it cannot go further than to claim respect for Christianity and make it probable that it is of Divine origin. Following, however, the plea from the character of Jesus, it has irresistible weight.

4. Is it ever literally irresistible?

By no means: the good work of the Christian religion in the world, and its manifest tendency to become the sovereign power among men, are by many blankly denied or accounted for on natural principles.

5. What then is the first great profession of the gospel?

To bring to every man who embraces it reconciliation with God through the cross, the entire sanctification of his nature, and victory over all fear for the future.

6. How is it justified?

By the experience of countless multitudes: against which, on the one hand, nothing can be rationally alleged, not even the inconsistencies of many professors of Christianity; though, on the other, it must be admitted that it is an argument that cannot be demonstrative to unbelief.

7. What further does it profess?

To introduce a kingdom of heaven among men the powers of which shall remove by degrees every yoke of ignorance, cruelty, misery and vice.

8. Has not Christianity notoriously failed to redeem this pledge?

(1) Before answering this, two things are to be taken into account: the kingdom of God must not be identified with the visible church, which has itself fallen into corruption; and the promise of our Lord was that the tree should slowly grow and the leaven gradually leaven the lump. The gospel does not profess to be an irresistible and despotic power.

(2) These reservations made, we may appeal: to the differ-

ence between the heathen world and the Christian ; the coincidence of Christianity and civilisation ; the elevation of woman; the gradual suppression of slavery ; the mitigation of war ; and countless blessings which the religion of Christ has given to a world that is by degrees becoming conscious of the benefit.

The Victorious Vindication of Itself by Christianity.

9. Has the success of Christianity over its opponents been such as to vindicate its claims?

Assuredly it has : always taking into account the spirituality of its claims ; and its own predictions concerning that success. We must always remember its own profession.

10. Will the argument allow these to be taken into account?

Certainly : for (1) it only professed to be a spiritual power, which should produce and overcome its enemies by conviction ; and (2) its predictions are part of Christianity itself, which teach us to expect a slow succession of victories.

11. But is not the present condition of Christendom in relation to the world at large a great preliminary obstacle?

Undoubtedly it is. There is no doubt, however, that Christianity is gradually suppressing every form of heathenism and superstition. Its ultimate universality is, even humanly speaking, merely a matter of time.

12. Has the Faith vanquished its first enemy, Judaism?

In the age after the Lord's departure, the chief triumphs of Christianity were over the Jews, who were and have continued its bitterest enemies. The religion of Jesus has now indisputably the place which Judaism once had. And the continuance of the ancient people, with their veiled Old Testament in their hands, is itself a standing triumph of Christianity ; even as their future conversion will be.

13. Can it be said to have triumphed over heathenism?

It has always triumphed over it as an opponent: wherever it has resisted, it has yielded or is yielding.

14. But has not heathenism sometimes vanquished its victor?

Yes: throughout its history. The heathenism of the Roman empire, Oriental philosophy, and Judaism—all vanquished—left their impress on Christianity; and its subsequent corruptions were the result. But the genuine influence of the Faith was never lost, nor ever without perceptible evidence.

15. Is not this at best an imperfect triumph?

Yes: if triumph is estimated on human principles. But to a thoughtful mind the fact that Christianity, so heavily encumbered, has done so much is a strong argument in its favour. As a merely human system it has been its own enemy.

16. But is there really any form of heathenism that has been abolished?

The mythologies of Greece and Rome; the Scandinavian, Gothic, and many other superstitions vanished in early times. In later days many of the ruder forms of heathenism are known to have been displaced. The more ancient and firmly rooted systems of the East are slowly but surely yielding.

17. If it be said that some of these decaying systems did in their time triumph over others, even as Christianity has: what then?

The inference suggested is that the influence of the Christian faith may also decline; but it is enough to say that it is giving no tokens of that. Moreover, we can trace in every great religious movement that has only for a time swayed the world the reasons of its decay: the want of truth or even the profession to bring truth, in some; dependence on the sword, and pandering to vice, in others; and, in the best, the lack of a universal mission. Christianity declares war against every other religion; conciliates nothing evil in man; and patiently but confidently waits its time.

18. But, finally, are not modern philosophy and science winning a victory over Christian faith?

Nothing can be less true than that. Philosophy is in its best forms paying its tribute to the essential doctrines of the

Faith. And science, though rejecting the supposed fetters of Scripture, is, when believing in God, coming more fully to believe in Christ also: agnostic Atheism is neither philosophy nor science. In any case, neither mental philosophy nor physical, can be said to be retarding or overcoming the Christian religion.

V.

The Holy Ghost.

1. In what sense have we here a credential?

The Christian revelation does undoubtedly base its evidence on the presence of the Holy Spirit: on the one hand, as enforcing its claims; and, on the other, as perfectly satisfying those who do not reject Him.

2. Is not this staking too much, by limiting the acceptance of Christianity to such as have personal experience?

The former part of our proposition precludes that: the Holy Spirit is given to demonstrate the claims of the gospel even to those who resist it, and even seem to disbelieve it.

3. Then the New Testament really witnesses to itself?

Its plea amounts to that. It comes with the promise of a Divine power; and is content to be rejected if that is not felt: this is apparently a PETITIO PRINCIPII, and so in its last issues is all argument for God and religion.

4. But surely the external evidences of Christianity are sufficient to command assent?

They have their force; but the Gospel itself does not appeal to them alone, *We are witnesses of these things; and so is the Holy Ghost, Whom God hath given to them that obey Him.* Acts v. 32. The testimonies of God and man meet.

5. What external witness of man is here meant?

The testimony borne to the resurrection of Jesus, as following the atoning death and preceding the ascension.

6. How does the Holy Spirit attest this?

(1) By for ever enshrining in the record and protecting

and commending to acceptance the *many proofs* of the resurrection which were given to a great number of honest and trustworthy witnesses: whose testimonies, calmly considered, are consistent and unimpeachable.

Acts i. 3.

(2) By confirming the evidence of the Lord's risen life experimentally in the fulfilment of His promise of an abiding spiritual influence as its result.

(3) By raising on the faith of His resurrection the Christian church, with its sacraments and its Lord's day and its permanent worship.

7. How is it then that self-evidencing light has failed to convince very many sincere doubters?

The process by which conviction of truth passes through assent into confident trust is tracked only by omniscience. If the soul is sincere before God, the inquiry must lead to Christ: if it do not, there must be some fatal flaw, though undiscernible by man. For He Himself has said: *Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice.* And again: *If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching, whether* IT *be of God, or I speak from Myself.*

John xviii. 37. John vii. 17.

8. Is not the objection of the Pharisees to this an irresistible instinct of the logical understanding?

In reference to every other claim but Christ's it is. But when they said, *Thou bearest witness of thyself: thy witness is not true*, it was while His words were in their ears, *I am the light of the world: he that followeth Me shall not walk in the darkness.* Still He cries: I AM HE THAT BEARETH WITNESS OF MYSELF.

John viii. 13, 12, 18.

9. What is our Lord's special testimony as to the Spirit?

After having said above, *Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto Me*, He closed by saying that the Advocate, the Spirit, *when He is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; of sin because they believe not on Me!* Christianity never appeals to any man and leaves him unconvicted, though it may leave him seemingly unconvinced.

John vi. 45. John xiv. 8, 9.

Chapter III.

The Inspiration of Holy Scripture.

§ 1. Inspiration.

1. What is the meaning of the term inspiration?

The inbreathing of God (*θεός, πνέω*), and the result of it. In the classics it is used of wisdom and dreams as given to man. In our sacred writings it is only once found: *πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος*, giving a great truth its final expression. 2 Tim. iii. 16.

2. Do we find there any definition of it?

(1) Its nature, method of operation and limits are nowhere defined: a fact of considerable importance in our inquiry.

(2) But there are many expressions which help us to understand it. For instance, as to influence on the mind, the prophets *spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; The hand* or *The word* or *the Spirit of the Lord* is said to *come upon* men; and David *in the Spirit* called the Son his Lord. 2 Pet. i. 21. Numb. xxiv. 2. 2 Chron. xv. 1. 1 Sam. x. 6. Matt. xxii. 43.

3. Do these passages limit inspiration to official utterances?

Not entirely; but we gather that the influence of the Spirit on speakers and writers of God's will is distinguished clearly from His influence, entrance and indwelling for personal salvation. There is always something special in it.

4. May we then refer inspiration to both speaking and writing?

The two are very strictly connected. Our Lord illustrates this when in one sentence He speaks of *Your law*, and says that *The word of God came*, and *The scripture cannot be broken*. So do the two later cardinal texts. St. Paul speaks of *all scripture* or *every scripture* as *inspired of God*, referring to the *sacred writings* of the pre- John x. 34, 35. 2 Tim iii. 16.

vious verse, and thus showing that ALL and EVERY really must mean the same thing. St. Peter makes *no prophecy of scripture* and *no prophecy* the same: the predictions and the books containing them were alike a result of the powerful impulse of the Spirit.

2 Peter i. 20, 21.

5. Are we justified then in connecting inspiration specifically with scripture?

The final testimony of St. Paul has led to the conventional use of the word according to which it signifies the specific influence of the Holy Spirit in the construction and perpetuation of the sacred writings.

§ 2. The Inspiring Spirit and the Inspired Writers.

1. What is here the specific office of the Holy Spirit?

(1) In the unity and intercommunion of the Holy Trinity God is the inspirer: *Every scripture inspired of God. Men spake from God*, though being *moved by the Holy Ghost.* All the acts and offices of the Three Persons severally are the acts and offices of the one God.

2 Tim. iii. 16. 2 Pet. i. 21.

(2) The Son is the source and sphere of all revelation; and still *the Spirit of Christ* was in the ancient prophets and is *the Spirit of truth* in the apostles.

1 Pet. i. 11. John xvi. 13.

(3) Hence, as the administrator of redemption in all ages, the Holy Spirit is the organ of Divine communications and the inspirer of the writers or the writings that record them.

2. How does the New Testament speak of the Spirit's inspiration in the Old?

In a style which assumes that He both speaks and writes in the ancient oracles:

(1) Our Lord's solitary testimony to the speaking is, *How then doth David in the Spirit call Him Lord?* but we must connect with this, *The scripture cannot be broken:* every voice and every scripture shares the prerogative of inviolability with this voice and this particular scripture.

Matt. xxii. 43. John x. 35.

(2) The later New Testament is still plainer. After Pentecost the first quotation runs: *That the scripture should be fulfilled which the Holy Ghost spake*

Acts i. 16.

before. The epistle to the Hebrews is most copious: *The Holy Ghost also beareth witness to us.* St. Paul says that *the Spirit speaketh expressly:* which last words however lead naturally to another question. Heb. x. 15. 1 Tim. iv. 1.

3. What is the evidence of the continued inspiration of the Spirit as found still in the New Testament?

It mainly rests upon our Lord's official promise spoken to the apostles as witnesses: the Holy Spirit shall *teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you; He shall guide you into all the truth; shall declare unto you the things that are to come.* First for the past, then for the continuous present, and lastly for all the future. John xiv. 26. John xvi. 13.

4. Do these sayings without violence sustain the inspiration of the New-Testament Scriptures?

When we take into account the deep importance of the occasion, that our Lord is speaking of an abiding testimony, and that the documents of the new covenant precisely answer to the respective parts of the triple promise, we may rest assured that they do without demanding further proof.

5. How do they thus answer that threefold promise?

(1) The remembrance of the past is found in the Gospels.

(2) The guidance into truth is the leading them onward (ὁδηγήσει) in Christ THE WAY (ὁδός) to all developments of that truth as it *is in Jesus:* this is strictly exhibited in the oral and written teaching of the apostles. John xiv. 6. Eph. iv. 21.

(3) The coming things are recorded in the prophetic parts of the New Testament, which are interwoven with the whole: the mystery is said to be made known *by the scriptures of the prophets.* In the last days also *the testimony of Jesus is the spirit* (as it were from *the Spirit*) *of prophecy.* Rom. xvi. 26. Rev. xix. 10.

6. What analogy is there between the methods of inspiration in the Old and in the New economies?

The direct communications from the Word, the suggestions of the Spirit, the dreams and visions, the commandment to WRITE, are as a whole and severally the same in both. Ex. xvii. 14. Rev. i. 19.

7. Do all these testimonies help towards a theory?

Only to a limited extent. They teach, however, that inspiration did not make the speakers and writers merely mechanical instruments; that in many instances the very words were given; that in all cases the influence of the Spirit guided the apostles' reasonings and their general applications of truth; and that the testimony to the Lord's life, or the early distinct Gospels, were arranged under a special superintendence of the Spirit which we may suppose to have been exceedingly minute. Precisely the same—no more and no less—may be said of the framework of the Old Testament.

8. Do the writers of the New Testament manifest any consciousness of this inspiration?

They show it precisely as the ancient writers showed it: by the assertion of an authority in their words not otherwise to be understood; by hints here and there which are full of significance; and by the uniform majesty of the whole.

9. Give instances in illustration of this.

St. Luke records the promise of oral inspiration: *The Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say:* compare this with his discourses of St. Peter, St. Stephen, and St. Paul in the Acts. St. Peter speaks of the new revelation as making the old *more sure;* as containing *the commandment of the Lord and Saviour through your apostles;* one of whom, St. Paul, approved the wisdom given him *in all his epistles*, which are classed with *the other scriptures*. St. John closes the New Testament by two notes: *I was in the Spirit*, the same John *who bare witness*, and was commanded, *Write therefore;* and, remembering the Lord's promise fulfilled in himself, gave the important testimony, *It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth.*

Luke xii. 12.

2 Pet. i. 19, iii. 2, 16.

Rev. i. 10, 2, 19.

1 John v. 7.

10. What is to be said of the inspiration of St. Paul, who so largely contributed to the New Testament?

Without applying to his own writings the word he applies to the ancient scriptures, he writes with precisely

the same authority as theirs. He stood in a special relation to both the Revealer and the Inspirer. He delivered to the churches that which also he *received of the Lord;* and when he spoke of that concerning which he had *no commandment of the Lord* he could still say, *I think that I also have the Spirit of God.* If any writer was God-inbreathed, he more.

1 Cor. xv. 3. 1 Cor. vii. 40.

11. Does St. Paul give any help towards a theory?

He illustrates everywhere the principles already laid down. We perceive that he had special and repeated communications of direct suggestion, in which revelation and inspiration are one; that he uses not *words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth*, when unfolding the hidden mystery that *God revealed through the Spirit;* and that he always retained his individuality of thought, diction and style.

1 Cor. ii. 13, 6, 10.

12. Why is not the gift or charism of inspiration mentioned where the dispensations of the Spirit are enumerated?

1 Cor. xii.

Because it was not peculiar to the Christian economy.

13. But, on the whole, do we not make the Bible prove its own inspiration by declaring it?

Undoubtedly we do. But its PETITIO PRINCIPII is abundantly justified by the Holy Spirit's influence on every one who hears these speakers and reads these writers with desire to know and do the will of God. NEVER MAN SO SPAKE.

§ 3. The Scriptures of Inspiration.

1. What names are given to the documents to express the idea of their inspiration?

(1) Such as refer to them as oral or spoken: generally, *the oracles of God*, which, as being intrusted to the ancient people, must mean the Old Testament; particularly, as used of individual passages, *living oracles*, or *the word of God.*

Rom. iii. 2. Acts vii. 38. 2 Cor. ii. 17.

(2) As written, they are *the scripture, the sacred writings.* This is St. Paul's last term; but he had

2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.

spoken of the *old covenant* as read, and from that sprang the modern distinction of the two testaments: the words being the same in the Greek.

2 Cor. iii. 14.

2. How is the term inspired applied to them?

As written by inspired men; but also as having in them an inbreathed and permanent power of life.

3. Does St. Paul's word bear both these meanings?

The word God-inbreathed might seem purposely chosen to combine them.

4. The scriptures being thus inspired, what character does this of necessity stamp on them?

(1) They must needs have plenary authority as the vehicle of Divine revelations sufficient, that is, in every province.

(2) Also they cannot be less than a certain standard of faith and practice and hope.

(3) They must be marked off from all other literature as alone containing Divine words and Divine writings.

(4) And, finally, their inspiration may be expected to commend itself as the witness of the Spirit who still lives and moves and has His being in them.

5. Inspiration being predicated only of the Old Testament, can the writers of the New be included?

We are now dealing only with inspiration, and it has been seen that the Lord promised to His apostles this specific gift. As to the New-Testament books which may claim it, this is a question belonging to the Canon of Scripture.

§ 4. Historical.

1. Is the idea of inspiration limited to our sacred books?

Many of the religions of the world have sacred books: recording a general faith in the inspiration of higher powers as acting on the minds of poets, soothsayers and lawgivers. But the scriptural idea in its purity and grandeur is unknown to them; nor is there more than a faint analogy.

2. What was the faith of Judaism on this subject?

Admitting degrees of inspiration, both the ancient and

the more modern Jews maintained a high theory of the plenary and verbal inspiration of their holy writings

3. Did the early Christian church maintain this?

(1) The reigning view throughout the patristic ages was precisely that of the Jews, from whom they received it.

(2) But germs of a laxer theory appear: the prophetic inspiration was elevated to the disparagement of that of some books not written by prophets; and the human factor in the Bible was by degrees made more and more prominent.

4. How was the subject treated in mediæval times?

(1) Gradually two concurrent inspirations were established, that of scripture and that of tradition: the former in the Bible, the latter in the teaching church. These the Council of Trent decreed to be of equal and united authority.

(2) Meanwhile two opposite tendencies were evident: a few scholastic divines elaborated an almost mechanical theory; while the mystical schoolmen, like the mystics of all ages, absorbed the direct influence of the inspiring Spirit in the high intuition of contemplative faith.

5. What was the point of view at the Reformation?

(1) It was the authority rather than the inspiration of scripture that ruled at the outset: Luther and Calvin were lax as to the admixture of the inspired and uninspired elements; the Lutheran formularies oscillated between an extremely high and a comparatively low view; the Calvinistic or Reformed, however, were generally strict in their theory.

(2) The Arminian divines limited inspiration to matters of faith: in fact making it one with revelation proper, and leaving all the rest to general direction or superintendence.

(3) None of the Reformation formularies decided on the question of verbal inspiration, as dictating the very words.

6. What form did this last question take in theology?

Most admitting that the very words were sometimes

suggested, the thought arose that, taking all the facts into account, it was better to assume instead of a verbal a plenary inspiration, this however covering many different degrees.

7. What bearing has the theory of degrees of inspiration exerted on the doctrine?

Much in all its history; though the theory itself like its application is indeterminate.

(1) The ancient Jews maintained a distinction between the inspiration of Moses, who spake with Jehovah face to face, and that of the later prophets and writers of the devotional parts of scripture; but they did not, like their later descendants as represented by Maimonides, make any difference in the result.

(2) Christian writers in all communions have more or less adopted the same thought: the inspiration of suggestion for express revelations; of elevation, as qualifying the receivers and writers; of general superintendency, for the arrangement and as it were editorial organisation of the whole.

(3) But, inasmuch as the result of all the Spirit's methods is incorporated in one volume, it is evidently His mind that no such distinction should be capable of verification.

(4) Meanwhile, He who said that *It is the* SPIRIT *that quickeneth*, said also *The* WORDS *that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life.* Neither can truth be given nor can it be received altogether and literally without words.

John vi. 63.

8. How does the modern critical spirit treat the question?

It attacks the doctrine in two ways: first, by granting inspiration, but taking away its essentially distinctive character; secondly, by denying inspiration, on the ground of internal unworthiness in the fabric of the documents.

9. In what way may the former be met?

(1) By appealing to scripture itself, which, though it does not define inspiration, expressly declares it to be or implies that it is a specific influence of the Spirit on those who spoke or wrote the Divine oracles. GOD-BREATHED can mean nothing less than this.

(2) As against those unbelievers who reduce it to a level

with the exhibitions of human genius, this is still the only answer. But it suggests that the advocates of the true doctrine should in their practice strictly limit the term to its right use.

(3) It holds also against a large class of Christians, who make inspiration the ordinary illumination of the Spirit raised to a higher and purer force.

10. Of what kinds are the latter objection?

Either it asserts that the matter of scripture is unworthy of the inspiration of God; or that the forms in which it is given by their internal inconsistencies discredit the doctrine.

11. The former evidently concerns the scripture as the rule of faith: how can the latter be met?

By analysing and carefully considering each objection: a duty incumbent on Christian learning, and one which the growth of Biblical literature makes constantly more easy and more profitable. There is a specific apology of the Bible.

12. If, for instance, it is said that an inspired volume cannot contradict science?

The answer is that it never does contradict science either intellectual or physical. Where they seem to come in collision, it is the interpretation of one or the other that is at fault.

13. If it is said that scripture does not quote scripture as if its very words were inspired?

(1) The reply is that this affects only an extreme theory of verbal inspiration: one pertinaciously holding fast the letter as if the words were as eternal as the truths they carry.

(2) The Divine Spirit may surely change His own words.

(3) Undoubtedly the Lord and His apostles sometimes cite the Septuagint as the current and as it were authorised version: to Whose authority we must bow without question.

(4) But there are many quotations which show such intention in the change as confirms the true doctrine. For instance, the prophet said, *Sanctify the Lord of hosts Himself;* the apostle says, *Sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord.* Isa. viii. 13. 1 Pet. iii. 15

(5) If we affirm that the Spirit may have been pleased to transmit different versions of the same sentences, or that He may have given words by inspiration which were then left to the custody of time and of various transcription: even this cannot be charged with absurdity.

14. How far do the modern terms plenary and dynamical solve these difficulties?

Very imperfectly. Both words are vague, having more of the semblance than of the reality of definition. If plenary signifies that the power of the Spirit is in every part of the Bible, adapting itself to the subject and securing that the doctrine shall be sound and the history true, it may be accepted as a tribute to the Divine element. If dynamical signifies that the human writers are always actuated by the Spirit as thinking, examining, collating, witnessing and reasoning men, it may be accepted as a tribute to the human element. The combination of plenary and dynamical is hard; but it is not impossible.

15. What is the sum of all?

(1) The Christian receives what are commonly called the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments as the mind and word of God given by His Holy Spirit through the instrumentality of holy men.

(2) He must have a strong faith in the watchful providence of the Spirit over the work of His own hands: whether as to the unknown history of ages past, the present with its assaults and objections innumerable, or the unknown future of truth in the world.

(3) He must expect that Spirit to breathe through the oracles within his soul His own effectual demonstration of the living and lifegiving power of the holy oracles.

(4) And, in the proportion that his faith forms for him a high theory of the inspiration of the sacred writings will be his own delight in them and sanctification through their influence.

CHAPTER IV.

The Canon of Scripture.

1. What does this subject embrace?

The question of what constitutes the collection of the sacred books of revelation : the Old Testament and the New.

2. How is the term Canon of Scripture used?

The term canon (κανών) means a rule or testing rod. The scriptural books are those to which the test has been applied. They are also the canon or testing rule of faith ; but it is the former meaning we now consider. The books were canonical or canonised, before they became the canon or rule of faith.

3. How is the canon related to inspiration?

Inspiration concerns the Divine influence on the writers ; but the determination of the canon concerns the number of the writers, and their claim to be held as inspired.

4. Is this a question outside of the books themselves?

Not altogether so. Whatever tests were applied were derived first from the books, and one part of scripture very much helps to give canonical authority to another.

§ 1. The Canon of the Old Testament.

1. What do Christians understand by this canon?

The Hebrew text of the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa or holy writings, as our Lord received and approved it and gave it to His disciples and the future church.

2. Is this the only ground of our acceptance?

The circumstances under which the canon of the Old Testament was finally closed are very obscure in history. Our

Saviour's authority is enough for those who cannot study the subject, and the best evidence for those who can.

3. From what is the Hebrew canon distinguished?

(1) From the Alexandrian canon of the Septuagint—a Greek translation of the third century before Christ—which includes some books not in the Hebrew; and (2) from the Apocrypha, as these last additions are now named: the term apocrypha signifying "hidden," in a sense of discredit.

4. Has the Saviour authenticated every individual book?

Not every book as such: but He quoted the scriptures as they were generally quoted. In the New Testament all the books save four are re erred to as sacred.

5. Has He directly or indirectly sanctioned the canon as such?

The three main divisions—*the law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms*—imply what is meant by the canon. Nor did He charge the corrupters of the interpretation with corrupting the text itself. Though the Septuagint is often used, the apocryphal books are never directly quoted.

Luke xxiv. 44.
Matt. xv. 6.

6. Does the Old Testament itself give any support?

From the first reference to the *Book of the law* onwards there is reference to one *Book of the Lord;* as distinguished from all other literature. After the captivities the limits of this were defined (B.C. 450-300) probably by a council of scribes.

Deut. xxxi. 26.
Isa. xxxiv. 16.

§ 2. The New-Testament Canon.

1. What parallel is there between the old and the new canons?

As the old covenant had its documents, so has the new. As the revelation of truth had been begun by oracles and writings, so might it be expected to end. As the ancient church had its books of statutes, devotions and prophecies, we might anticipate that the new would have the same. The New Testament is in many respects the counterpart of the Old.

2. Does the New Testament itself profess to constitute a second body of holy writings?

Not directly. There are many signs, however, in almost all the documents that the writers were writing authoritatively and for permanence: signs as plain as in the Old Testament.

3. How does this bear on the meaning of canon?

(1) The writers appeal to their credentials: inviting the application of the canon, or testing rule, to themselves.

(2) They also write as the arbiters and final authorities in doctrine: applying their writings as the canon or testing rule of all things, with an authority from which they allow no appeal.

(3) These two meanings of the word canon point onwards to the Rule of Faith.

§ 3. Historical.

1. How was the Old Testament treated in the early Christian church?

Both our Lord and His apostles largely used the Greek version: almost as if the Hebrew Scriptures, like the temple, had lost their prerogative. But they never quoted the apocryphal additions; and these were very hesitatingly admitted into such of the early lists as mentioned them.

2. What was the history of the formation of the New-Testament canon?

Three centuries were occupied in defining its exact limits; though the volume as a whole, as we now hold it, was accepted and reverenced in the second century. Doubts existed as to a few books which some accepted and a few which some rejected.

3. What tests were applied and by whom?

(1) The tests were apostolical authorship or authorisation; and, in the case of the Homologoumena, all the churches were historical vouchers as it were with one consent.

(2) In the case of the Antilegomena, difficulties arose which have been felt more or less to the present time. The test here was mainly the common "Rule of faith," which decided the gradual rejection of certain apocryphal books, with the writings of some apostolical fathers, and, as combined with

the testimony of individual churches, secured the gradual acceptance of the epistles which had been suspected.

4. How stood the question of the canon at the Reformation?

(1) The Mediæval churches had accepted the Old-Testament Apocrypha: they were included by the Council of Trent and by a later decision of the Greek church. Lutheranism, like the Anglican church, admitted parts of them for public reading; but, as they were never in the Hebrew canon, present internal evidence of being uninspired, and have no place in the history of redemption, their canonical authority has been rejected by Protestants.

(2) The churches of the Reformation laid great stress on the internal witness of the Spirit in their decision as to what must be included in Holy Scripture. The books that lay under doubt were called deutero-canonical and placed at the close of the New Testament.

(3) The Arminians, like the Reformed churches, received the Bible as we hold it: much on the general and indefinite principle of the Anglican article, which speaks cautiously but truly and wisely of "those canonical books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the church." The questionable books were not generally doubted.

5. What are the questions involved in the modern controversy as to the canon?

(1) The determination of the GENUINENESS of the book: as being the very document itself that was received from the beginning, as from its professed author.

(2) The grave investigation of the AUTHENTICITY of the records, or their trustworthiness as being true deliverers of what they profess to hand down.

(3) Only the former strictly belongs to the subject of the canon: the latter belongs to the Rule of Faith.

6. Is there any real difference between these?

There is actually in modern times only one inquiry as to any document: its worthiness of credit. Much of the Bible is thought to be untrustworthy or spurious as professing to come, for instance from Moses, Isaiah, Daniel, John

the apostle, Simon Peter, and untrustworthy or fictitious in its representation of fact. The whole is only one impeachment; and challenges the authority of revelation generally.

7. How does the uncertainty of the text affect the question?

We must accept these facts: (1) that it has not pleased the Author of scripture to preserve its autographs; (2) that He has committed its books to the care of His church, which both in Jewish and in Christian ages has watched over them with great care; (3) that the Holy Spirit Himself has exercised a special providence over their transmission, translation, and exposition; (4) and that the science of Biblical Criticism has a prosperous function in deciding as to larger interpolations and smaller variations in the text.

8. But surely the uncertainty of the text must throw some disparagement on the canon and its inspiration?

Here it is important to make some distinctions.

(1) When the question touches the entire fabric of the Old Testament, and an attempt is made to show that the Pentateuch and the subsequent books of the Old Testament were, like the writings of the prophets themselves, productions of a later age and records of an imaginary history, it becomes vital: unless that kind of criticism is discredited the canon must be given up. The same may be said of the attempts to reduce the genuine New Testament to a very few original documents. As to these attacks on the canon, the student may be sure that the further he advances in his study the more surely will he *know the certainty concerning the things* in the faith of which he has been brought up. Luke i. 4.

(2) There are some doubtful points as to the canon—not affecting the inspiration or canonical authority of scripture generally—which must be left or may be left to the conscientious private judgment of the inquirer.

(3) As to the exact text of the two Testaments, there is little hope of its being recovered till it will be wanted no longer. Meanwhile, we are gradually and surely approximating to exactitude, and the variations that defy decision do not affect in any degree the fundamentals of the truth.

Chapter V.

The Canon as Rule of Faith.

1. What is meant by this application of the word?

The Canonical Scripture is here viewed as itself the Canon to measure and determine the value of all knowledge and of all other Christian literature.

2. What range of subjects is embraced?

We have to ask in what sense, and under what conditions, scripture is a final authority; and then consider the bearings of this on historical controversy.

§ 1. The Rule of Faith Supreme and Sole.

1. With what latitude is this to be taken?

(1) The Bible is the standard of what is to be believed; the directory of duty; and the charter of Christian promise: in other words, of faith, morals, and privileges.

(2) But as these together constitute the substance of the Christian verity to be accepted, all may be summed up under the one common head of the Rule of Faith.

2. What is the testimony of scripture itself?

It everywhere assumes to be a final authority: *To the law and to the testimony! Do ye not* THEREFORE *err, because ye know not the scriptures?* It appeals to itself always, and never to anything else save for confirmation of its own words.

Isa. viii. 20.
Mark xii. 24.

3. Does not all this refer to the Old Testament and the dispensation of the letter?

(1) The same reason which demanded a final standard in the old economy demanded it much more in the new: the new

containing not only the infallible interpretation of the old but also its own new truth of supreme importance.

(2) Hence the writings of the New Testament professedly give *the mind of Christ* and that as *confirmed unto us by them that heard.* They are added to *the other scriptures.* 1 Cor. ii. 16. Heb. ii. 3. ■ Pet. iii. 16.

4. Still, all this is only their own witness to themselves?

It is one that approves itself to our reason, which admits that if God gives a revelation to man it should speak AUTHORITATIVELY, PERSPICUOUSLY, and sooner or later TO ALL.

§ 2. Historical.

1. What opponents has this principle to withstand?

If we omit those who deny a Divine revelation altogether, there are two: the adherents of Rationalism at one extreme, and those of Traditionalism at the other.

2. How does Rationalism object?

It either makes reason the basis of man's universal religion, and then denies that any one class of sacred books can be its standard; or, assenting that Christianity is the absolute religion, it makes reason the sole arbiter of what scripture means or must mean, thus undermining its final authority.

3. And how does our Rule of Faith meet this?

(1) By conceding to reason its own province, as the minister of faith: a province allowing private interpretation to the man *that is spiritual.* (2) By prescribing its limits: *The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.* (3) By appealing to reason itself, which ought to admit that the most important truths in a revelation from heaven concerning spiritual and eternal realities must be beyond the limits of reason, whether as ■ discoverer or as an interpreter. 1 Cor. ii. 15. 1 Cor. ii. 14.

4. What is Traditionalism?

The system which accepts scripture as the rule of faith, but qualifies this in two ways: first, by making its interpretation dependent on the infallible voice of the church, speaking through its representatives; and, secondly, by establishing the

co-ordinate authority of an oral tradition handed down from the beginning in that church.

5. And how does our Rule of Faith meet this?

As in the case of Rationalism. (1) By conceding the great importance of tradition in its own place, as transmitting the testimony of the church to the books of scripture and its early interpretation of them. (2) By denying that tradition has ever been allowed a place co-ordinate with the inspired scriptures. *Teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men:* this sentence of our Lord condemned what afterwards became the vast fabric of the Jewish Talmud, and forbids any Christian imitation of it. (3) An appeal to the results of the principle of a double standard in the history of the ancient church is its most effectual condemnation: decisions contrary to the word of God, and contrary to each other, abound

Matt. v. 9.

6. What is the relation to this of the theory of development?

This theory is a modern appendage of the older doctrine of a continuous authoritative voice in the church: assuming that, by the will of God, truths only the germs of which are found in scripture were to be expanded as the ages passed. But an infallible standard would never leave articles of necessary faith in germ; that notion is contradictory to the principle of a rule

7. What is the latest development of this?

The decree of 1870, which made the Pontiff or Bishop of Rome infallible arbiter in every matter coming before him for personal decision EX CATHEDRA.

8. What objections may be urged against the general principle that the Bible is the sole rule of faith?

Only such objections as may rather be turned into cautions; such as the differences in the confessions of the churches, and the irregularities of private judgment.

9. And what is to be said as to these?

(1) That the rule of faith is only the standard by which all confessions are to be tested. (2) That as to the essentials of Christianity there is a wide range of evangelical unanimity. (3) That the individual is responsible for his private judgment, and has the promise of the Teaching Spirit.

BOOK II.

God.

I. THE HOLY TRINITY.

II. THE DIVINE ATTRIBUTES.

III. HISTORICAL DISCUSSIONS.

BOOK II.

God.

Preliminary.

1. What is God in the scriptures of revelation?

The One Being, the Source of all existence, Who reveals Himself by names and attributes and works which belong to Him alone.

2. Is there difference between the names and attributes?

(1) As God can be known only as He reveals Himself, His names are in a certain sense attributes. Elohim is God as fulness of power; El-Shaddai is the Almighty; El-Elyon the Most High, the Supreme; Adonai is the Lord as Master; Jehovah is absolute and self-existing Being. Gen. xvii. 1. Gen. xiv. 18.

(2) Elohim, Θεός, and Jehovah, Κύριος, are however the preeminent names of God as such.

(3) The attributes are those perfections, whether single or manifold, which are given by God to Himself, that by them we may regulate our thoughts concerning His infinite and incomprehensible nature.

3. Is not the proof of God's being a preliminary?

No: that may be considered in historical review: here we MUST BELIEVE THAT HE IS. Heb. xi. 6.

4. Have we to trace a gradual revelation?

(1) In the name we find it: God and Jehovah in the Old Testament become in the New the Three-One, the Most Holy Trinity. By this name He had not been known. Matt. xxviii. 19. Ex. vi. 3.

(2) In the attributes there is no development: some of them, however, such as justice and love, are revealed in new forms and manifestations.

(3) And the full revelation of both the names and the attributes of God is connected with the full revelation of His works in creation, providence and redemption.

I.

The Triune God.

1. On what ground do we thus begin the doctrine of God?

It is well for us to begin where our Lord ends, who commands that all nations should be baptised INTO THE NAME *of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.*

Matt. xxviii. 19.

2. Is this then His final revelation of God?

Thus our Lord will have *all the nations* taught, consummating all former and partial instruction; *Baptising them into* denotes the confession, worship and service of Three Persons in the Godhead; and *the Name* assures still the unity of those three Persons, or the essential unity of God.

3. Should not the mystery of the Trinity be postponed until questions concerning the notion of God and His attributes have been studied?

To us the mystery of the Trinity is God. We should carry this to the attributes and other revelations as the standard of all; and the result will justify our so doing.

4. This being so, how may we study the doctrine?

By shedding the light of our Lord's revelation on the past; by considering it in itself as the final doctrine of the Divine Triunity; and by tracing its redemptional development through the subsequent Christian scriptures.

§ 1. The Triune God in the Earlier Revelation.

1. In what sense may we seek to trace this?

By marking certain mysterious hints, in the Divine names and manifestations and worship and prophecies, which reveal their meaning under the fuller teaching of the New Testament.

2. Which are they in the Divine names?

The first and most universal term ELOHIM is plural, ■

peculiarity of the Hebrew form of the word. JEHOVAH is the name by which God revealed Himself to sinful and redeemed man: in Genesis, to man as a race; in Exodus, to the people of the Mosaic covenant; and in the New Testament as the Triune Jehovah. The mystery of the Trinity perhaps lay in the form of the word Elohim; and in the Divine interpretation of the word Jehovah, which is I AM and I AM TO BE WHAT I AM TO BE. This God says of Himself; man puts it into the form of Yahveh, HE IS, Jehovah, or LORD. Ex. iii. 14.

3. What in the Divine manifestations?

In the earlier books of the Bible the appearances of God or Jehovah, the THEOPHANIES as they are called, were sometimes in the form of angels or men. Moses spake to Jehovah *face to face*. In the plains of Mamre three men appeared to Abram, while one Lord spake to him; but one Angel, and one Man, is preeminent. Of Him Jehovah said *My Name is in Him*. It was *the Angel of Jehovah* who gave Abraham the first promise, swearing *by Myself*. With Him Jacob wrestled; and Hosea says that this Being was *even Jehovah, God of hosts*. Deut. xxxiv. 10. Gen. xviii. Ex. xxiii. 21. Gen. xxii. 15, 16. Hos. xii. 4, 5.

4. How may it be observed in the ancient worship?

In the temple the glory within the veil, and the seven-branched candlestick outside, waited their interpretation. The levitical benediction, which *put My Name upon the children of Israel*, distributed that name in a threefold form. And the doxology was *Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts*. Numb. vi. 27. Isa. vi. 3.

5. How, lastly, in the prophetic hints?

There are many of these. In Isaiah we read *The Lord God, and His Spirit, hath sent Me*, the future Redeemer of men. And in Zechariah *the Spirit of grace* is promised by Jehovah to lead the people to *look upon Me whom they have pierced*. These two are specimens of a style of speech that suggested to ancient Jewish interpreters the dim outlines of our doctrine of the Trinity; but which was utterly incomprehensible until the light of the New Testament explained it. Isa. xlviii. 16. Zech. xii. 10.

§ 2. The Triunity of the Baptismal Formula.

1. What is meant by Triunity here?

That our Lord, the final Revealer, still gives to our faith the One and ancient Name, but as Three in One.

2. Then is the testimony to the Trinity a testimony also to the Unity?

Emphasis is laid on INTO THE NAME. On that name, Jehovah, the monotheistic confession of Judaism was based: *Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah*, or our only God. This passage—known as the SHEMA, or MEMORIAL preeminently,—has been always the Jewish confession of faith; and our Lord came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it: Monotheism is the Christian confession also.

Deut. vi. 4.

Matt. v. 17.

3. Explain further the bearing of our Lord's testimony to the unity of God.

(1) The unity of the Godhead was taught in the Old Testament in two ways: first, as the ground of undivided worship; and, secondly, as protest against idolatry. We must receive the baptismal confession in the light of this.

Deut. iv. 39
Isa. xliv. 8.

(2) If the Three Names in the One Name are the object of one worship, and this is still a protest against idolatry, they must be equally Divine. Were the Son the highest creature, and the Spirit the second, or a personified influence, our Lord would in effect have contradicted the Old-Testament doctrine.

4. But it may be argued that, while our Lord asserts the unity of God, the baptising means only the subordinate recognition of two persons in redemption.

This redemptional Trinity must be based upon a Trinity in the absolute essence. All nations are to be drawn from idols to serve the true God. INTO THE NAME signifies into the final revelation of Jehovah; and the THREE PERSONS are the New-Testament meaning of the I AM WHAT I WILL BE.

1 Thess. i. 9.

5. What are we taught here concerning the relation of the Three Names?

That the Father and the Son have eternally such relation

as in human language is thus expressed ; and that the Spirit is a name also derived from human speech which is given to an eternal Person. Son and Spirit are terms used by God Himself.

6. What is taught of the Father first ?

He is revealed as a Father in His relation to men, especially believing men. But this is on the ground of a special relation to His eternal Son, His only begotten. Not only is He the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ* as Incarnate, but the Son was originally *in the bosom of the Father*, and sent as such by Him. *Neither doth any know the Father, save the Son.*

1 Pet. i. 3. John i. 18; iii. 16, 17. Matt. xi. 27.

7. Under what conditions is the term Father generally used ?

Sometimes with express reference to the Son ; and sometimes as standing for God generally, as the Head of the redemptional Trinity. We find both in St. John's final testimony, *God hath sent His only begotten Son into the world ;* and *The Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.* And perhaps in St. Paul's : *Who is over all, and through all, and in all.*

1 John iv. 9, 14. Eph. iv. 6.

8. Then the Eternal Sonship has an essential relation to the doctrine of the Trinity ?

It has; and nothing is more important than to distinguish between this and those applications of the term Son which refer to the incarnate estate. *Thou art My Son ; this day have I begotten Thee !* is applied in the New Testament to the full manifestation of the Son as Mediator; but St. Paul teaches that the Son as such is *the Image of the invisible God, the Firstborn before every creature*, Who is *before all things.*

Psalm ii. 7. Acts xiii. 33. Heb. i. 5; v. 5. Col. i. 15–17.

9. What other terms express the Divinity of the Second Person ?

He is called the Logos or Word, the eternal Revealer, Himself God. His relation to the Father is expressed as His having been before the incarnation *in the form of God, the Effulgence of His glory, and the Very Impress of His substance.*

John i. 1. Phil. ii. 6. Heb. i. 3.

10. What is the specific relation of the Third Person ?

The Spirit receives three peculiar denominations from the

Great Revealer. Two of them, *the Paraclete* and *the Spirit of truth*, express His relation to us; the third, *Who proceedeth from the Father*, expresses His eternal relation to God and in God. In that relation His name is always THE SPIRIT, or THE HOLY SPIRIT, or THE SPIRIT OF GOD.

John xv. 26.

11. What is the scriptural evidence of this?

The two points of the Personality and the Divinity of the Spirit go together:

(1) The identity of God and the Spirit of God runs through the Bible. Whoever the Spirit is, there is no distinction between Him and God: St. Paul draws an analogy between the Divine Spirit and *the spirit of the man which is in him.*

1 Cor. ii. 11.

(2) The distinct personality of the Spirit is among the revelations of our Lord, who emphatically supplements His testimony to the eternal procession by the words, *Whom I will send* and *He shall testify*. The general strain of scripture similarly combines the two: the eternal procession and the temporal mission are blended almost into one.

John xv. 26. Gal. iv. 6.

12. What other arguments prove the Holy Trinity?

The Divine attributes which are ascribed to the Two Persons: to Them indeed especially, as will be hereafter seen. Whatever may be said against the Divinity of the names Son and Spirit, as sometimes used with a more limited meaning, the ascription of any Divine attribute to either is ample demonstration: Divine perfections can belong to God alone.

13. How may we sum up at this point?

(1) It must be remembered that the mystery of the Trinity is the supreme revelation to faith, embracing in a sense all other mysteries.

(2) And the terms Generation for the Son and Procession for the Spirit are given by our Lord to express an eternal subordination in the Godhead, one however which infers no inferiority of essence in the Two Persons.

(3) That this subordination in the absolute Trinity is the mysterious ground of the redemptional or economical Trinity.

§ 3. The Trinity in the Later Scripture.

1. Does the revelation of the Holy Trinity by our Lord govern the later doctrine concerning God?

The essential unity of the Godhead remains still the great governing idea, which orders the phraseology. But the Trinity constantly appears in its relation to the redeeming work, as our Lord prepared us to expect that it would.

2. How did He so prepare us?

By those specifically doctrinal discourses in the paschal chamber, which were really His final testimony to the Trinity, preceding and explaining beforehand the baptismal formula. In them He spoke of Himself as at once a revelation of the Father and inferior to Him by the incarnation; and of the Spirit as at once proceeding from the Father and sent by the incarnate Son.

John xiv. 9, 28.
John xv. 26.

3. Does not the early history of the propagation of the gospel in the Acts disappoint our expectation as to the Trinity?

(1) We must remember that in evangelising both Jews and Gentiles the essential unity of God was preached as the supreme truth and necessary foundation.

(2) That baptism *into the name of the Lord Jesus*, as alone, meant the Lord's baptism as distinguished from every other: it does not imply that the Triune Name was not used. Moreover, fuller instruction followed baptism.

Acts xix. 5.

(3) That the history of the spread of the gospel contains the abundant materials of Trinitarian doctrine.

4. How may this be shewn?

Especially by the combination of the Three Persons in the teaching given to the churches.

5. And how is this combination seen?

Everywhere we see the Three Names of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit bound up with the processes of redemption; and that in such a manner as to be utterly inexplicable save on the ground of their equal Divinity.

6. Can these passages be classified?

To classify them would be a large and profitable study. For instance, to give three specimens:

(1) In the dispensation of grace. *Through Him we both have our access in One Spirit unto the Father.* In the diversities of gifts, ministrations and workings, there is the *same Lord, the same Spirit, the same God.*

Eph. ii. 18.
1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6.

(2) In the interior economy of religion *the Father* is supplicated for His *power through His Spirit in the inward man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith*, and thus that we *may be filled unto all the fulness of God.*

Eph. iii. 14—21.

(3) In the worship of the church the apostolical benediction, the calling on *the name of our Lord Jesus Christ*, the *praying in the Holy Ghost*, and the ascription of glory to Christ, are sufficient evidence. In the other world invocation of grace is from the Three Persons, and the highest glory is offered to Jesus as the Redeemer of mankind.

2 Cor. xiii. 14.
1 Cor. i. 2.
Jude 20.
2 Tim. iv. 18.
Rev. i. 4, 5, 6.

7. As it regards this last point, is there not a marked absence of adoration addressed to the Trinity in Unity?

It must be remembered: (1) that the worship of God is the worship of the Trinity; (2) that in the economy of redemption the Two Persons are subordinate, One as the Mediator and the Other as the Inspirer of worship; and (3) that until God is ALL IN ALL that subordination continues.

1 Cor. xv. 28.

II.

The Attributes of God.

1. What is the difference between Divine names and attributes?

Every name of God expresses His whole being; but the attributes indicate various aspects of the Divine character; and no one is independent of the others.

2. In what way does revelation speak of them?

By asserting (1) as from God Himself, what He is in His own perfection; (2) what He is not, or denying imperfection

to Him ; and (3) that He has the qualities which account for all that is. Thus, the old divines followed scripture when they spoke of reaching adequate notions of the Divine attributes VIA EMINENTLÆ, VIA NEGATIONIS, and VIA CAUSALITATIS.

8. How are the terms, attributes, perfections, glory, and properties to be used of God?

The glory—not glories—is the manifestation of the Divine nature to the bodily or spiritual eye of His creatures. Property, or propriety, notes what belongs to God viewed as a Person, or in a threefold personality. When the term perfections is used we mean the assemblage of attributes each of which as perfect is a perfection. But attributes is the aptest term, as avoiding the idea of distinction in the Divine nature, and meaning only what God permits us to attribute to His unfathomable essence.

4. Is there any classification of the attributes in scripture?

There are constant indications of it. For instance, sometimes God is spoken of as independent of creaturely existence, and the attributes are a negation of the limits of matter and time and space: more frequently His attributes are such as require the universe for their existence ; and most frequently they are such as connect Him with moral beings and man especially. This scriptural order we must follow: in preference to any such classification as natural and moral, communicable and incommunicable, or the like.

§ 1. The Unrelated Attributes.

1. What is the force of unrelated?

It means that it is the dignity of the human mind to be capable of at least thinking of God as the Only Being. But every term or nearly every term we use to express this must be related to the creature, and seem only to deny limitation.

2. What qualification is here necessary?

It must be remembered that the same revelation which speaks of God as in Himself unconditioned or absolute or

unrelated to things, speaks of Him as having internal relations. But the internal properties of the Divine essence—His unity and triune subsistences—are not attributes. The only exception might seem to be love; but that is called the very nature of God: *God is love*, and *Love is of God* (ἐκ.)

1 John iv. 8, 7.

3. Which then are the absolute attributes?

They are two, each of which governs a class; spirituality and infinity. God is the Infinite Spirit.

4. How are these related?

Together they express in human language our conception of an incomprehensible essence: God is an infinite Spirit. The former is positive: we believe that God IS A SPIRIT; the latter is negative: we believe that He is INFINITE, a Being who has no possible or conceivable limitation.

5. How is the spirituality of God taught?

In the Old Testament as opposed to materiality. Our Lord's new revelation is, *God is spirit:* His only definition.

John iv. 24.

6. What attributes hang upon this?

Personality: God is a Spirit WHOM we must worship as *the Father* in spirit, and He is *the Father of spirits.* Immutability or simplicity of nature: *Who only hath immortality.* But here the term NATURE is not so appropriate as ESSENCE.

John iv. 23. Heb. xii. 9. 1 Tim. vi. 16.

7. How is the infinity of God taught?

In the scripture as immensity, in relation, or rather out of relation, to space: *Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee;* and eternity, in relation, or out of relation, to time: He is *the everlasting God*, or *the God of eternity.* Hence springs the self-sufficiency of the Divine essence, as being absolute: *I am the First and I am the Last, and beside Me there is no God.* His being is therefore necessary being. And from all this follows the Divine unity, as an attribute: there can be only one such Being.

2 Chron. vi. 18. Gen. xxi. 33. Isa. xliv. 6.

8. Is then the infinity of God only a negative idea?

The term infinite has a negative form, but infinity in the human mind is its highest positive idea: we measure limitation by it, and do not measure it by limitation. *He hath set eternity in their heart:* the deepest mystery in our nature. Eccles. iii. 11.

9. Are these attributes ascribed to the Trinity?

The Son is *the Lord*, *the Spirit*, Who by *Eternal Spirit offered Himself*. The Third Person is revealed pre-eminently by this name. And of the Son it is said that all things outside of the Divine essence are the works of His hands: *They shall be changed; but Thou art the same*. The self-sufficiency of God is that of the Three Persons in eternal communion; having in Themselves the possibilities of the created universe, and of the ABSOLUTE attributes' becoming RELATIVE. 2 Cor. iii. 18. Heb. ix. 14. Heb. i. 12.

10. What is the sum on this subject?

That these attributes are unfathomable; that it is our highest dignity so to reflect them in our finite nature as to be able to apprehend though we cannot comprehend them; that they are the eternal ground of all other attributes; expressing all of them collectively and individually rather the essence than the several perfections of the Deity.

§ 2. Attributes Related to the Creature.

1. What is meant by this expression?

That many qualities are ascribed to God which have no meaning save as related to the creaturely existence.

2. What is their relation to the absolute attributes?

It will be seen that each of them is based upon an absolute attribute, under a divinely appointed limitation, real and not figurative, to time and things.

3. What is aimed at by this distinction?

The importance of remembering in every discussion that we must keep the two apart without understanding how it

may be. For instance, to the Eternal, as above time, all is one unchanging NOW; but, having created time, His omniscience has its true temporal past and present and future.

4. Which are these attributes?

They are, in the order of human thought, Freedom, Omnipotence, Omnipresence, Omniscience, Wisdom and Goodness: all necessarily presupposing a sphere of creation.

5. Do we here exclude what we call the moral attributes?

These really spring out of the first and the last, freedom and goodness. But we are limited here to the creature as such and universally. The moral attributes refer only to a part, the best part, of the creature, and must be reserved.

6. What is freedom as an attribute of God?

Freedom means the will of a personal agent, conscious of originating his own act. There is no absolute personal agent but God: the creaturely origination of act is real, but derived and dependent and responsible.

7. What are the bearings of this attribute in theology?

It takes the lead in creation, as the Triune will; it contradicts pantheism; it issues the decree of redemption, and presides over the government of the moral world. It is decretive and absolute; or, if permissive, only as harmonised with other attributes such as goodness, though not limited by them.

8. What is the relation of omnipotence to this?

It is expressed thus, *He hath done whatsoever He hath pleased;* but not all that He can do is it God's will to do. Omnipotence is assigned to the Supreme VIA CAUSALITATIS; it simply accounts for all that is. Hence it is impressed on our minds in our idea of causation; everything has its cause, and the FIRST CAUSE is the will of God executed by omnipotence, the attribute which ministers to His will. Hence, further, every difficulty that can arise here must be carried higher: to what we call purpose in God as the Holy Trinity.

Jer. xxxii. 17. Psalm cxv. 3.

9. How does scripture treat the Divine Omnipresence?

God is present in all His Divinity everywhere: *Do not I fill heaven and earth?* But it is better to say that all things are present to God: *In Him we live and move and have our being.* Jer. xxxiii. 24. Acts xvii. 28.

10. And how is Omniscience related to this?

(1) The universal presence of God is essentially His universal knowledge: *All things are naked and laid open* before His eyes. (2) The God of eternity, becoming the God of time, knows the past and the future as such: remembrance, observation, and foreknowledge belong to Him whose *understanding is infinite*, or beyond reckoning. (3) The most impressive aspect of the attribute is the foreknowledge that is bound up with what man calls contingency. Heb. iv. 13. Ps. cxlvii. 5.

11. What is Wisdom as an attribute of God?

It is ascribed by God to Himself as the use of that infinite understanding in the employment of means to attain ends in the created universe both physical and spiritual.

12. And what is Goodness?

The lovingkindness which wills the welfare of the creature as such. *The earth is full of the goodness of the Lord.* It has many names, as signifying the diffusive kindness which is *over all His works.* The existence of evil may be thought to conflict with this. But without reason; for *the goodness of God endureth continually* in contending with sin and its consequences. The origin of evil is sealed from us. Ps. xxxiii. 5. Ps. cxlv. 9. Ps. lii. 1.

13. Are all these attributes assigned to the Three Persons?

In the Old Testament the Word or Wisdom of God and His Spirit represent all the Divine attributes in the creaturely universe. In the New Testament Christ is *the power of God and the wisdom of God;* while *the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.* But both the Son and the Spirit are in the economies of creation and redemption regarded rather as the Agents by Whom the attributes are 1 Cor. i. 24. 1 Cor. ii. 10.

exercised. Moreover, the Son in His estate of humiliation displays them no further than they are capable of being manifested in human nature. Though as Divine He has all the perfections of Deity, omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience are limited by the sphere of His incarnate work.

§ 3. Moral Attributes; or, Attributes related to the Moral Creature.

1. On what principle are these distinguished?

As God creating a universe limits His attributes in relation to it, so as the Creator of moral and free intelligences He assigns to Himself moral attributes belonging to that relation.

2. But are not the principles of morality eternally in God?

The God who is absolute, and without a creature, is of course the same God who creates and governs the world. But, unless we suppose created intelligences, we cannot suppose in Him holiness, righteousness, grace, mercy, or truth.

3. Does not this seem to imply that God created morality?

And that is certainly true: there is no creature without obligation; and no obligation without a creature. Of the Eternal neither obligation nor responsibility can be predicated.

4. Is not God eternally holy, and just, and true, and good?

Holiness being separation from evil existent or possible, justice supposing a law administered, truth implying obligation and responsibility, and goodness being either estimated as such or received by a creature, they all imply creaturely intelligences.

5. Where may we find a link between the eternal essence and the ethics of Divine relation to the creature?

In Love, which is the eternal property of the Triune God, in the intercommunion of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost: the final interior basis of all that is external.

6. Is love then the sum of the moral attributes of God?

It would be so if all creatures were under necessity of goodness; but their probationary freedom renders evil possible, and hence arise other attributes in God.

7. What other attributes?

All those which guard against evil, holiness being at their head: answering to love, the head of the diffusive attributes.

8. Then do love and holiness divide them all?

Yes: but not as distinct. God is one; His attributes are one in Him; and the combination of love and holiness will be found of great importance throughout theology.

Holiness, and the Protective Attributes.

1. How is the Divine holiness treated in Scripture?

In two ways: (1) As the attribute which expresses the separation of God from all evil; and (2) the perfection to which man is called in the Divine fellowship.

2. Are not these contradictory?

(1) In the case of the unfallen, the holiness of God is viewed as the separation from evil as possible.

(2) The fallen are severed from God by sin for ever: His holiness alone would never recall them; but it is not alone.

3. How then are sinners partakers of His holiness?

Through the intervention of atonement only. *Ye shall be holy; for I am holy!* is said to those who have purified their souls in the way ordained of God. The atonement at once protects Divine holiness and restores it to man. 1 Pet. i. 16, 22.

4. How is the justice of God related to this?

What holiness is to the Divine nature, righteousness is to the Divine government.

(1) God's rectoral righteousness ensures the perfection of His laws and their administration.

(2) His judicial righteousness is the attribute that assures perfect justice in the distribution of rewards and punishments.

5. Is it consistent with the supremacy of God's love and the majesty of His name that exacting and retributive righteousness should be ascribed to Him?

(1) Majesty is the attribute that places God at the head of

the creaturely universe; and nothing that tends to His glory can be inconsistent with His several perfections.

(2) Love is supreme among and not over the moral perfections of the Divine nature.

(3) But, finally, both the glory of the Moral Governor and the good of the governed demand that righteousness in God should have its full character and its unforced definition.

6. How is that taken from it?

By theories of righteousness which make it simply the conformity of God to His own established order, whatever that may be: thus making it synonymous with His goodness.

7. What is its defence?

(1) This current idea of righteousness will not suit many passages of scripture: especially that one which speaks *of the righteous judgment of God, Who will render to every man according to his works.*

Rom. ii. 5, 6.

(2) There are other attributes, and names of attributes, which express that softer idea of righteousness.

8. Which are they?

Truth and Faithfulness: God is true in His revelations, and faithful in His promises and threatenings, though the latter aspect is not made so prominent as the former.

Love and the Saving Attributes.

1. How is the Divine love towards moral agents treated?

In two ways: (1) as the attribute that provides salvation; and (2) administers that salvation under many names.

2. Does love in God supremely provide and administer salvation?

(1) Not as of necessity: for it is displayed only on conditions. *Herein is love . . . . that He loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins.* And hence it is only shewn to man in Christ: it is reserved for the atonement.

1 John iv. 10.

(2) But it is supreme: as sending the Greatest Gift; as

throwing always the restraint of mercy over the judgment of God; and thus presiding over the beginning and the end of redemption, though not as silencing righteousness. John iii. 16. Jas. ii. 13.

3. What forms does love take?

It is Grace in Jesus as resting on the unworthy; Compassion, or pity as viewing misery; Mercy as remitting penalty. But its names are as many as the aspects of man's evil.

III.

Historical.

1. What belongs to an historical review of this whole question?

We have seen that in scripture there is one doctrine: that God is, and that revelation is a continuous development of His name and attributes as the redeeming Trinity. All independent speculation on these two subjects belongs to the history of human thought.

2. What has been the range of independent speculation?

Under the first head come arguments for and against the being of God; with questions as to the possibility and the limits of the knowledge of the Infinite. Under the second all speculations, whether outside of revelation or within the Christian church, as to the interior plurality of the Godhead.

§ 1. The Being of God as a Question.

1. Has this ever really been questioned?

In a certain sense it has; if we may judge by the arguments which have been used in all ages to prove it.

2. Why "in a certain sense"?

Because the argumentation itself seems to assume that which it argues about.

3. How may this be explained?

Man was created in the image of God; and by the very constitution of his nature inquires after the Being from Whom

he came, on Whom he is dependent, and to Whom he is responsible.

4. Does this mean that the idea of God is innate?

Rightly understood, it is innate. As man surely comes to consciousness of self and the outer world, not self, so he comes to the consciousness of a Being above both: all this being innate or connate, though at first undeveloped. It is born in or with man as a faculty to seek and a capacity to receive the knowledge and enjoyment of the God who made him.

5. What is the testimony of revelation to this?

Ps. xiv. 1. Eph. ii. 12. It never proves that God is: the atheism it rebukes is always and everywhere moral.

6. Does not revelation use arguments in that appeal?

Only to encourage or confirm the belief it assumes, and Rom. i. 28. the obscuration of which it attributes to sin.

7. What is the line of scriptural argument?

It makes its constant appeal as follows:—(1) To the sense Acts xvii. 27, 28. of God in every human spirit; (2) to the logic of Isa. xl. 21. every mind, arguing from the creation to an adequate Ps xix. 1—3; xciv. 9. cause of it; (3) to the universal marks of design; Rom. i. 18. (4) to the conscience of man as a sinner; (5) to the Rom. ii. 15. Acts xvii. 26—29. agreement of all nations, taught by God Himself to *feel after Him and find Him.*

8. But this seems like the line of theological argument?

It is so, but with a difference. The scripture speaks to rebuke man's trifling with his convictions. Theological argument professes to convince unbelievers as such.

9. Who then are on this question the unbelievers?

It is usual to term them Atheists. But this is an indefinite word, requiring analysis and classification. Strictly speaking, there is but one logical form of unbelief; and that is ANTITHEISM, which argues against the possibility that there can be a God. Pantheism does not deny that God is, but

will not admit that He is distinguished from the universe. Agnosticism denies only that He is an object of thought.

10. How are the demonstrations of the being of God conducted?

In such a way as to meet all these at once. But it must be remembered that their demonstrative force is no more and no less than what scripture assigns them. In their new terminology they may be presented as follows :—

(1) The Ontological argument: that the idea of the Infinite, or God, in the human mind implies A PRIORI a corresponding object.

(2) The Cosmological: that an absolute First Cause of all things is a necessity of thought.

(3) The Teleological: that marks of design, infinitely diversified yet all converging to final ends, demand a Designing Creator.

(4) The Moral: man's indestructible sense of dependence, responsibility, and desire points to a Supreme Father and Ruler and End of his being.

(5) The Consensus Gentium: in all ages, and among all men, some sense of the supernatural is found, though varying in its errors from the lowest fetichism to the highest pantheism.

§ 2. The Possibility of a Notion of God.

1. What is the meaning of this question?

It has been argued that the finite mind cannot comprehend or define an infinite object, that is, form an adequate concept and express a complete definition of it; and therefore that all demonstrations of God are efforts to prove that Something is behind all phenomena to which no demonstration can warrant our giving a defining name.

2. And what are the bearings of this question?

It is of wide and fundamental importance: in fact, it vitally concerns every error as to the being of God, whether of the antitheist or the theist.

3. How does it bear on Antitheism?

It really removes the ground from under it. While Agnosticism urges that the Power behind the universe cannot be known, Antitheism professes to have such a knowledge of its necessary attributes as to be sure that it cannot exist: the most stupendous instance of proving a negative.

4. How does it bear upon Pantheism?

The term expresses that what we call God is the sum of all things, the universal substance as manifested by what we call the attributes of spirit and matter. It may be said that Agnosticism, denying of course the possibility of so clear a conception of what God is, cannot fairly be pantheistic.

5. What other errors does it oppose?

There are no others: all the fundamental errors as to the Deity are summed up in these two, Antitheism and Pantheism. And each means, when pressed to its issues, that what the human intellect cannot define IS NOT. Agnosticism must on its own principles deny that: it supposes Something that IS.

6. But we have not yet answered its own argument?

Indirectly it has been answered. But more positively the following positions may be taken:

(1) God is an object not of definition but of knowledge.

(2) Knowledge is the right relation of the mind to the truth of its object; and this holds of the Supreme Object.

(3) The definition of an object of knowledge is far more what it excludes than what it includes: we know in part only almost all that we know.

(4) Many things that are practically indefinite and unlimited we nevertheless know; and the finite, in constant contact with the Infinite, knows it with a real knowledge which though limited is sufficient for every practical purpose.

7. Is this the "regulative knowledge" which those allow who deny that we can know the Infinite Being?

No: they admit the second and third of these terms, but

refuse the first. We must maintain that our limited knowledge is not only SUFFICIENT but REAL: that there is no knowledge more real than this.

8. What is the testimony of scripture on this subject?

(1) That God is both unknown and revealed. *No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son,* John i. 18. *Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared* Acts xvii. 23. *Him. Whom ye worship not knowing, Him set I forth unto you:* this saying of St. Paul, studied in its context, bears out our application.

(2) That there is a knowledge of God which is not only real, but synonymous with the soul's highest life: *And this is life eternal that they should know Thee.* John xvii. 3.

§ 3. The Trinity.

1. How far has this mystery entered into human speculation?

Much more extensively than is sometimes assumed. A certain triad is found in most of the ancient Asiatic religions, in the Egyptian, and in the religious philosophy of Plato. But nothing that even approaches a Trinity in unity can be traced.

2. Did not later Judaism find the doctrine in their ancient books?

Rabbinical writers in early Christian ages collected many testimonies from the oral expositions of their scriptures which, they affirm, were the basis of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. Whether some of these were or were not themselves due to the New Testament, they are valuable testimony to Jewish opinion and secret tradition.

3. Do the Gospels indicate that our Lord appealed to any latent Trinitarian idea?

He constantly prepared His hearers for that full revelation of God which, equally with the salvation of man, was the end of His mission. But, as He did not lift the veil from His atonement until He suffered, so He did not declare the Trinity until the Holy Spirit came. His full testimony to the Third

Person was given in His last discourse; but His entire ministry was a perpetual appeal to the faith of the covenant people in an Eternal Son of God.

4. Do the scriptures give any hints to prepare for future dogmatic expositions of the Trinity?

Very few, if any. The writers of the New Testament, having Jewish monotheism and Gentile polytheism in view, are instructed to do no more than furnish a multitude of testimonies to the personality, Divinity, and relations of the Three Persons. These would demand, when the kingdom of our Lord was fully set up, the terminology which we now use.

5. By what stages was this terminology reached?

By the expansion of the Baptismal Formula; by the triune classification of the doxologies of scripture and the benedictions; by the introduction in the second century of the term TRIAS or TRINITAS; and by the adoption of the conventional distinction between *οὐσία* for the NATURE common to the Three Persons and *ὑπόστασις* for the PERSONALITY belonging to each.

6. What was the earliest development in the doctrine as such?

That which has been called in later times Subordinationism: the logical expression of the revealed truth that the Son was
John i. 18. John xv. 26. the only begotten God and that the Spirit proceeded from the Father. The ORDER of the Trinity, and the relation of this to the Generation of the Son and the Procession of the Spirit.

7. What was the Sabellian heresy?

The denial by Sabellius, in the third century, of the Three Personal Subsistences in the One God. Its trinity was simply three modes in which that one God presented Himself to man: first as Jehovah, then as the Son, then as the Holy Ghost.

8. What was Arianism in relation to the Trinity?

The doctrine that the Son was begotten of the Father's will, and therefore, though before all worlds, was not eternal.

The Spirit, also, it taught, came into being in God and from God in order to the creation.

9. How may we state the relation of these three?

Together they prove that the Trinity in Unity was the earliest doctrine. The first heresy, Sabellianism, arose out of an exaggeration of the Unity which denied any subordination Arianism so exaggerated the idea of subordination that the Unity was lost. But both were protests against sundry forms of Unitarianism, or Monarchianism, which heretics had devised, especially in the second century.

10. How was subordinationism developed?

Authoritatively, in the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed. GOD OF GOD, as it respects the Son; WHO PROCEEDETH FROM THE FATHER AND THE SON, as it respects the Spirit.

11. What were the bearings of the controversy as to the procession of the Spirit?

The addition FILIOQUE, "and from the Son," to the Nicene Creed, was rejected by the Eastern Church; and was one reason of the breach between East and West.

12. What were the characteristics of mediæval speculation?

It was much occupied in endeavours to find analogies of the Trinity in the constitution of human nature and the processes of thought; as also in constructing the terminology of the internal and external relations of the Three Persons.

13. Had all this any value?

Great value in obviating objections; and in protecting the doctrine they had their use, especially as continued in the dogmatics of the Reformation. But, as aiming at a solution of the unfathomable mystery, they had no value.

14. What was the later development of the order or subordination of Persons in the Trinity?

(1) Reaction against it gave birth to a doctrine scarcely distinguishable from Tritheism: that of three distinct Gods.

(2) After the Reformation the earliest Arminian divines made it very emphatic; but their descendants proved the danger of too careful definition by verging on Arianism.

(3) In later times there was much exercise of human subtilty in tracing analogies between the interior life of the Trinity and the exterior manifestation of God in the universe. This also had its unhealthy reaction.

(4) During the sixteenth century Socinianism revived the ancient Monarchianism, or the doctrine of the absolute unity of God: but with a certain effect of Arian subordinationism lingering in it which raised its conceptions of the Son and the Spirit much higher than those of modern Unitarianism.

15. What have been the modern bearings of the question?

(1) It has been closely connected with controversy as to the Eternal Sonship: the doctrine which may be said to be the central element of our Lord's own teaching concerning Himself throughout the Gospels.

(2) And it has been found of great importance as the eternal origin of the temporal subordination of the Two Persons in the work of redemption.

16. What lessons are taught by the history of controversy on this subject?

The importance of remembering (1) that this ultimate mystery of Christianity must be accepted by faith and profoundly adored; (2) that it is the regulative doctrine of the whole system of Christian truth; and (3) that it must be the ceaseless care of the teacher or preacher so to order his language as to avoid the three cardinal errors of Tritheism, Sabellianism, and Arianism.

BOOK III.

God and the Creature.

I. CREATION.
II. THE CREATED UNIVERSE.
III. PROVIDENCE.
IV. HISTORICAL DISCUSSIONS.

BOOK III.

God and the Creature.

Preliminary.

1. Why do we not pass at once to Creation and the Creature?

Because the doctrines concerning God and concerning the created universe are most intimately connected. Much that is generally treated under the former belongs equally to the latter: for instance, Pantheism, Polytheism, Dualism; which really are questions involving the relation of the creature to the Creator. And certainly the subjects which now lie before us are never safely studied saving in strict connection with the true doctrine of God.

2. Preserving this combination, how shall we proceed?

By considering first the God of creation; and then the God of providence.

3. What is the link between these?

The first deals with the How and the What of creation; the second deals with the How and the Why.

I.

Creation.

1. What topics present themselves here?

Mainly two: the connection of creation with God and His attributes; and the creating acts or processes themselves.

2. How is this question to be dealt with?

First, as matter of revelation, which gives it a large place; and then in relation to human theories and speculation.

3. Is not this too extensive a field of inquiry?

We are shut up to a few plain principles: First, it must

be remembered that theology regards the question as one of pure faith: *By faith we understand.* It must, secondly, be remembered that we have to do with the created universe mainly as the sphere of redemption.

Heb. xi. 3.

4. Does not science conflict with revelation here?

Science has absolutely nothing to say about creation proper. Its reasonings concern the processes of nature, or God in nature, in the construction of the universe; or what may be termed secondary creation. And as to this, our duty is simply defensive: to show that science does not overturn the general teachings of the word of God.

§ 1. God the Creator.

1. How does revelation speak of God as Creator?

It begins with the truth that *God created the heaven and the earth.* But the Three Persons of the Godhead are connected with the process of creation. *The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.* Of the Son it is said that *without Him was not anything made that hath been made.*

Gen. i. 1. Gen. i. 2. John i. 3.

2. What is the special relation of the Three Persons to the creature, as disclosed in the later scripture?

It is somewhat similar to that which They sustain to redemption: Their relation to the latter being within a narrower circle, and after a different manner.

3. How are the Divine attributes related to creation?

(1) All the relative attributes are displayed in the universe and are to be understood in its laws: power and wisdom supremely. (2) But the freedom of the Divine will, or His good pleasure, originated all: *Of Thy will they were, and were created.* (3) Majesty and other terms indicating the supremacy or lordship of the Creator, ascribe to Him His glory.

Rev. iv. 11.

4. Is not the glory of the Divine attributes to be regarded as the end of creation?

Not certainly the only final cause: the Supreme has no need of that. His glory is rather the result than the end.

§ 2. Creation Proper.

1. What does this import?

All things were called into existence by God.

2. Does revelation teach that this was from nothing?

"From nothing" has no meaning. Scripture says that the Son was *before all things*, spiritual or material; that God *calleth the things that are not as though they were;* and that *What is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear.* Col. i. 16, 17. Rom. iv. 17. Heb. xi. 3.

3. What is the full force of these passages?

The first shows that all things include the whole universe of spirit and matter; the second that to the will of God not being becomes being; and the third lays it on faith, as its first recorded triumph, to understand that the visible creation did not spring from preexisting things about to become phenomena.

4. How may we sum up all this?

By the assurance of faith that the creation came into existence through God's will; that in the ordered universe His wisdom presides over the word of His power; that the Son was the source of existence as outside of God; and that the Holy Spirit was and is the organ or administrator of all life.

§ 3. Creation as Formation.

1. How does this limit our subject?

By confining it mainly to the Cosmos, or ordered universe.

2. Is the distinction found in scripture?

When it is said that by faith we understand that *the worlds have been framed by the word of God* we are taught that the successive ages of the universe were brought into order by creative fiats. This secondary creation is most spoken of. Heb. xi. 3.

3. Then the construction of the world is matter of faith?

Yes, faith in the record that gives us to understand how the universe as seen came into existence. Every great change is to be regarded by faith as a Divine effect of creating will.

4. What then is the record referred to?

The Mosaic account of the creation; which, like the events it describes, we receive by faith as a Divine revelation to our first parents, through whom it passed to Moses.

5. Is the Mosaic record, strictly speaking, a history?

It is that kind of history which it pleases God to give for the assistance of faith when He describes the visible appearance of His *invisible things*, even *His everlasting power and Godhead*. A literal history was impossible; what we have is the Divine symbolical teaching of certain great lessons.

Rom. i. 20.

6. Is this teaching independent of scientific verification?

In one sense, it must be so: *by faith we understand*. But, in another sense, it is not independent: science will in due time go far towards explaining the laws of the beginning and the laws the operation of which will bring the end.

Heb. xi. 3.

7. Meanwhile, what is the teaching of the Mosaic record?

(1) That all things were created by one God; (2) that they were created according to laws, the evolution of which proceeded from lower to higher; and (3) that the whole was ordered in creative epochs ceasing with the creation of man.

8. Is this the meaning of the six days?

These epochs are connected with a seven days' reckoning by the will of the Creator; each day representing to us a period of undefined extent. The sabbath of His rest from creative activity is now running on; and is weekly commemorated.

9. Is this a sufficient account in the light of science?

The Divine history is a hymn of creation: simply above and beyond scientific criticism. Two things are indisputably true: first, that it teaches an evolution proceeding within the limits of KIND even in the seventh age, while creative interventions have ceased; and, secondly, that it represents man as the end of all, which science also does without avowing it.

II.

The Created Universe.

1. In what way is this described?

As *The heaven and the earth*, *All things*, *The creation or creature*, *The world*, *The worlds*, *All things visible and invisible.* Gen. i. 1. John i. 3. Rev. iii. 14. John xvii. 5. Heb. i. 2. Col. i. 16.

2. Under what relations are these presented?

Chiefly in regard of redemption. But this is in such a manner as to furnish materials for a complete view of the universe.

3. What is here meant by the term universe?

The sum of things viewed as ONE: the unity of all being supremely in God, subordinately in the human mind.

4. How may we distribute the creation in harmony with this?

As the world of spirits, the material world, and man.

5. Can we regard these as entirely distinct?

We know not the relation of spirits to the material universe; and man is composed of matter and spirit. But we may consider the three parts of the creation as distinct; the doctrine of the creature here being between those of creation and providence.

I. The Universe of Spirits.

1. How may this expression be justified?

It is the plain teaching of revelation that before the creation of the visible world a universe of spiritual beings existed: unlimited in number, and as orderly in gradation as the visible economy. The same name, *the Lord of hosts*, is given to Jehovah as Creator of the heavenly bodies and of spirits. Isa. ii. 12. 1 Kings xxii. 19. Jer. xxxiii. 22. Deut. xxxiii. 2. Dan. vii. 10. Col. i. 16.

2. What is recorded as to their creation and history?

(1) They occupy a large place in the Old Testament; but their creation is presupposed. In the New, their creation is assigned to the Son, and that in their hierarchy or order, as corresponding to what in the material universe is the Cosmos. (2) Again, it is presupposed in the Old Testament that before

the history of man they had two estates, fallen and unfallen: the fallen, represented by Satan, the unfallen by the attendants and ministers of Jehovah. In the New Testament their fall is dimly alluded to as preceding that of man.

1 Tim. iii. 6. Jude 6.

3. What view is presented of their relation to the universe?

They are uniformly described as spirits in their nature, and as angels intermediary between the Holy Trinity and created things. But one law governs the revelation: that they are bound up with the providential government of mankind.

4. How are they related as spirits and as angels?

(1) As spirits they are *Sons of God*, and addressed themselves as *Ye gods!* The fallen among them are still in their order, *spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places:* that is, *principalities*, *powers*, *worldrulers* in the supernatural order. In their relation to men they are under one head, the devil; and serve him as *demons* or *unclean spirits*, who have power over both the bodies and the souls of men: as to the former, they are instruments of disease; as to the latter, of deception and temptation, though this is referred generally to Satan.

Job i. 6. Ps. xcvii. 7. Eph. vi. 12. Mark v. 12, 13. Job ii. 7. Luke xiii. 16. 1 Tim. iii. 7.

(2) As angels, they are almost always seen to minister holily to the Divine will: from *the archangel* down to those representatives and guardians of the little ones of Christ who are called *their angels*.

1 Thess. iv. 16. Matt. xviii. 10.

5. What is the preeminence of Satan in Angelology?

He is marked out as a personal agent, the original sinner, and the head of all opposition to the Divine will. His many names are as it were official: *The god of this world*, who has *his kingdom* and *his angels*; *Satan*, or the adversary; *That wicked one;* The tempter; *The devil*, or the slanderer, his last and abiding name.

2 Cor iv. 4. Matt. xii. 26; xxv. 41. 1 John iii. 12.

6. What suggestions of importance occur here?

(1) The teachings of scripture are so consistent and unique that no parallel need be sought in extra-Biblical sources.

(2) The view given of the universe would be incomplete without the doctrine of spirits in their gradation and order.

(3) The personality of Satan and of evil spirits is intimately connected with the whole history of redemption.

(4) We may regard the angels as our fellow worshippers, in the communion of saints, avoiding the two extremes: the *worshipping of the angels*, on the one hand; and the forgetfulness of their great place in the universe, on the other. Col. ii. 18

II. The Material Universe.

1. Does anything correspond to this phrase in scripture?

Neither matter nor any of its compounds occurs there. The general view is that *things visible and things invisible* were created in the Son, and in Him *consist* or *hold together*. God by Him *made the worlds;* and He is *appointed heir of all things:* heir, the Eternal Son, of His own creation. Col. i. 16, 17. Heb. i. 2.

2. Is any plan of creation ever referred to?

The worlds express the Divine glory; but always in connection with the Son and the destiny of mankind. As the end and head of creation He is *The Beginning* (ἀρχή) *of the creation of God;* and its end, *All things were created through Him, and unto Him* as its τέλος. Rev. iii. 14. Col. i. 16.

3. Is the universe viewed only in the light of redemption?

By no means. (1) The Son is more than the Redeemer. (2.) But His relation to the worlds is limited to the world of man: as it respects both its origin and its end.

4. How is this truth related to scientific theories as to these?

(1) It leaves science perfectly free to investigate the laws by which the WORD acted, from *Let there be light* onwards: as it regards either the construction of cosmical systems or the preparation of the earth for human history. Gen. i. 3.

(2) The end of the material system as to man is predicted to be by fire, by which *the elements shall be dissolved:* in other words, *they shall be changed;* and science abundantly sanctions this prediction and shows how it may be fulfilled. 2 Pet. iii. 10. Heb. i. 12.

5. How does this limitation otherwise affect theology?

(1) It teaches the lesson of the transcendent superiority of the spiritual creation over the material: the greatness of the

latter is measured by unlimited worlds and systems of worlds; that of the former by the incarnation of the Son of God.

(2) Man has to seek his salvation as ignorant of all other beings, save where their existence affects himself.

(3) It opens a vista of the revelations that are to come hereafter. The present teachings of science minister to Christian hope.

III. Man.

§ 1. His Creation.

1. How is the origin of man described?

As the end of creation. First, as mankind, and in relation to the creature, *Male and female created He them.* Secondly, as *the man*, preeminently, in relation to his own history and destiny: out of whom, ISH, woman, ISHA, *was taken.*

Gen. i. 27.
Gen. ii. 7, 23.

2. How was he distinguished from other animals?

God breathed into him, in the act of his formation out of the dust, *the breath of lives.* The life was common to him and the lower orders; but into him it was breathed by the Spirit as a life peculiar. And in his personality, as man, he was created by the Holy Trinity *in Our image, after Our likeness.*

Gen. ii. 7.
Gen. i. 26.

3. Do the two accounts of man's creation agree?

Perfectly, if their several purpose is observed. In the second, Elohim becomes Jehovah Elohim; they were not, however, independent documents, but Jehovah is introduced as the God of the covenant based upon redemption, and the second record of man's creation is introductory to his fall.

§ 2. The Image of God.

1. What is the importance of this?

It is the one note of the essential, inherent, and indestructible dignity of mankind throughout the scripture: essential, as constituting man a free spiritual personal agent; inherent, as not arising from anything added after his creation; and indestructible as a character of human nature.

2. Is there any distinction between image and likeness?

The image may refer to the pattern in God, the likeness to the copy in man. But the original words do not suggest this; they indicate by repetition the importance of the fact.

3. Do they divide between the natural and the moral image?

(1) The distinction is not alluded to in the first creation; and the same words are used about the image of Adam in his son. Gen. v. 3.

(2) In the New Testament there is an indirect reference to the moral image of God as having been lost in Adam and retrieved in Christ. The new man is *being renewed unto knowledge after the image of Him that created Him;* or *after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth.* Col. iii. 10. Eph. iv. 24.

4. What does this teach as to the relation of these?

(1) That the natural image was the free personality which was capable of reflecting the Divine character.

(2) That the moral image was man's possession of truth and righteousness and holiness in their principles.

(3) That the fall was a descent from a high estate and the arrest of a glorious development.

5. What relation does this bear to the Son?

The Son, as such, is the supreme *Image of the invisible God*, revealing to the created universe *His substance* and His moral attributes: in the image of that Image man was created. Col. i. 15. Heb. i. 3.

6. What relation to the Holy Spirit?

The Spirit was *breathed into* man, as his immortal and holy life. We cannot say to what extent the fall deprived him of that Spirit: but we know that He continued His influence in the human soul; and that the Saviour, after His resurrection, *breathed into* His people the same Spirit. The word ἐνεφύσησε is used only of these two. Gen ii. 7. John xx. 22.

§ 3. Man's Relation to the World.

1. What does the first narrative teach on this subject?

That, as bearing the image of his Creator, he was placed in authority over the earth and all creatures on it: this dominion was not the image but a prerogative of the image. Gen. i. 26.

2. Does it shed any further light on it?

While as yet unfallen the man was appointed to cultivate the earth, to subdue it to his own uses, and thus to acquire dominion over it. At the same time he was able to understand the creatures below him and give them their names.

Gen. ii. 15. Gen. i. 28. Gen. ii. 20.

3. How does later scripture refer to this?

Gen. iii. 17–19. (1) The sentence after the fall makes man's impotence in the world very emphatic.

(2) In the second Adam man has retrieved his dominion: the Son of man has it absolutely, and His people will share it.

(3) Man and the earth will be restored to their relation.

§ 4. His Probation and Federal Headship.

1. How are we to understand Adam's probation?

Probation means the test or trial of free intelligences, issuing in confirmation of character good or evil. We know it only as trial addressed to good and evil in our nature, and cannot understand its application to unfallen beings. Revelation describes it in the terms known to us. The sensible world was a sphere of temptation; an evil spirit applied it; the issue was the fall; but the interior secret it is vain to investigate.

2. What was his federal headship?

Federal refers to a covenant (fœdus); and the idea is that Adam represented his descendants in a covenant. But it is better to regard Adam as the natural head of the race, one in him; and to leave the covenant to the Second Head.

§ 5. Creation and Redemption.

1. In what sense are these connected?

While the history gives us a record of creation as such, the creation of man is bound up with the history of his redemption.

2. Was he then created to be redeemed?

This question takes us beyond our faculties. But St. Paul, while he never speaks of man's creation as an eternal purpose, speaks of his redemption as such: especially in relation to the mankind of which Christ will be the Head.

Eph. i. 4, 5. Rom. xvi. 25.

§ 6. Historical.

1. What are the leading topics of controversy here?

There are very many points in which the modern science of Anthropology comes into conflict with the biblical account. We regard the questions discussed among believers in revelation.

2. How is this restriction justified?

The speculations excluded belong to the wider subject of creation in relation to God. Scripture is very explicit as to the place of man in the universe as the product of a Divine purpose and act; but it leaves room for inquiry on some topics of interest: for instance, as to the unity and antiquity of the race and the essential elements of human nature.

3. What are the bearings of the question as to unity?

The unity of the race in its two heads is fundamental; and it is of great importance to discuss thoroughly the manifold grounds on which the latest science bases its conclusion that the varieties of mankind are consistent with a common origin. Here of course the question of sufficient time enters.

Acts xvii. 26.
Rom. v. 12.

4. Does the Bible harmonise with the antiquity of man?

Perfectly, if that necessary antiquity is not stretched too far back. The New Testament speaks generally of long past ages and of Christ as having come at the end of the world. The Old Testament runs through these ages; but its chronology is very obscure, especially as to the times before the flood. Meanwhile, an extremely high antiquity is, on the one hand, not proved by any established facts, and, on the other, is quite inconsistent with the recent beginnings of history and the present comparatively limited distribution of mankind.

5. What are the discussions as to human nature?

The question of the meaning of *living soul* as used of Adam, and contrasted by St. Paul with the *quickening Spirit*, has taken many forms. The nature of man is the same throughout: body and soul being the current distinction between his bodily and his spiritual elements; body and soul and spirit expressing this with reference to the process of religion.

1 Cor. xv. 45.

6. How is all this sustained by scripture?

(1) The first record that underlies all declares that man was created in the Divine image: therefore as a personal spirit.

Gen. i. 26.

(2) He *became a living soul*, when his relation to the earth is mentioned. His spirit in God's image was a soul as using a bodily organ: the soul is his proper self.

Gen. ii. 7.

(3) Man's soul as regenerate is regarded rather as spirit: *That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.* And the spirit not possessed by the Holy Ghost is regarded rather as soul: *Sensual*, or *animal*, *not having the Spirit.*

John iii. 6. Jude 19.

III.

Providence.

1. What is the meaning of Providence?

It expresses the truth that God orders and governs all things for the attainment of the purpose of their creation.

2. How is this found in the word?

The word providence means foresight and provision. Three ideas concur: *πρόθεσις*, purpose; *πρόνοια*, provision or forethought, for the accomplishment of the purpose; and *πρόγνωσις*, which is the purpose regarded as accomplished, and therefore, as every purpose of God must be, foreknown.

3. How is the providence of God described?

Precisely as His creating act is: with the same relation to the Holy Trinity. As the Three Persons concurred in the beginning, so They conspire to bring all things to their end.

4. What is the range of the operation of providence?

Most widely, the conservation of all things for their end; then, more specifically, the preservation of created life; and, in the highest sense, the government of moral intelligences.

§ 1. Providential Conservation.

1. What is meant by conservation?

Not merely preservation against danger, but continuing all things in existence in their frame and harmony.

2. In what way is this attributed to God?

The Divine omnipotence is always the ground: God being *strong in power, not one faileth.* But that strength is put forth through the Son, *upholding all things through the word of His power.* If this is the Father's power, the Son Himself exerts it, *for in Him all things consist,* or *hold together.*

Isa. xl. 26. Heb. i. 3. Col. i. 17.

3. Does not this amount to continual creation?

Certainly not: the words just quoted show the distinction. As also the words: *Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created: and Thou renewest the face of the earth.*

Ps. civ. 30.

4. But how does providence apply to the upholding of all?

Because nothing exists without a purpose, or *in vain.* All things subserve an ultimate Divine intention, for the attainment of which they are preserved or *hold together.*

Isa. xlv. 18. Col. i. 17.

5. How may this be illustrated?

(1) As it regards the universal economy of created nature, the eternal counsel of providence is hidden from us. Of the Son it is said that *in Him were all things created,* and, *through Him and* UNTO *Him,* who *is before all things.*

Col. i. 16, 17.

(2) As it regards our own earth, the design of providence is plain: the earth was prepared through successive ages to be the abode of life; lower life was ordained to give support to higher; and the highest life is sustained for spiritual ends.

6. Are we required to believe that the conservation of created nature is maintained by the direct action of God?

Yes; for there is no power but the Divine: *In Him all things consist* and *in Him we live, and move, and have our being.*

Col. i. 17. Acts xvii. 28.

7. Do not great difficulties arise here?

There is no difficulty in the thought that the Being who gives existence to all things is present to them in His power. The pressure arises when we make the sustentation of God lie at the root of things evil and at the spring of evil acts.

8. How are these difficulties met?

The expedient of Secondary Causes has been resorted to, as that of Concursus or natural cooperation of the Supreme apart from the moral. But our only refuge is submission to hidden mystery.

§ 2. Providential Care.

1. What is meant by this?

The special provision made by the wisdom and goodness of God for the sustenance, preservation, and continuance of all organic life: that is, of those creatures of God within the outer sphere of the universe which are dependent on supplies that do not naturally come and the absence of which causes suffering. These two conditions do not apply to inorganic matter.

2. Does the phrase "the providence of God" refer to this?

It does, as generally used to distinguish His general care of His creatures: first, from the conservation of all things, and, secondly, from the government of the Mediator in the kingdom of grace and the Spirit's special guidance of believers.

3. What of the terms general and special providence?

Strictly speaking, they have no meaning. God equally provides for all His creatures as such. *Not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father*, spoken of the sparrows, and *The very hairs of your head are all numbered*, spoken of men, are parallel, notwithstanding the *But* between them.

Matt. x. 29, 30.

4. What difference does the But signify?

(1) That men are more important than sparrows; and (2) that the saints are objects of a special complacency and care to the God, not so much of providence as, of grace.

5. What are the difficulties that arise here?

(1) The lovingkindness of God which is *over all His works* subjects the lower creation to the law of preservation by mutual rapine, and to great misery at the hands of man.

Ps. cxlv. 9.

(2) The care of God over saints does not distinguish them from the ungodly in the allotments of providence.

6. And how are these difficulties to be viewed?

(1) Some they drive to Antitheism: in the form at least of Dualism, which is the atheism of blind reason.

(2) Others take refuge in a ruthless fatalism, disguised as Predestinarianism.

(3) Those who accept the scriptures are by them instructed to wait for the solution of the second difficulty at the future world and the day of judgment. The first difficulty is never mentioned in the Bible, which speaks of the wild beasts which *roar after their prey and seek their meat from God.* Mal. iii. 14–18. Ps. civ. 21.

§ 3. Providential Government.

1. What does this expression signify?

That there is a sphere of providence to which alone the term government applies: He who sustains all things, and cares for creatures as such, governs moral intelligences and governs them providentially or according to a fixed moral order.

2. Then this includes all intelligent beings?

Yes: we perceive that in probation, law and judgment, spirits and men are one. But we are specially concerned with the providential government of our own race: as sinful, as redeemed, and as under individual process of salvation.

3. Then this doctrine extends over a wide range?

It embraces literally all: the counsel that ordained probation, permitted sin, provided for its abolition by a Redeemer, prepared the world for His coming, ordered the methods of man's recovery, overrules all things for the spread of the Church and good of believers, and secures the ultimate vindication of Divine holiness. With reference to all these the terms that denote providence are directly or indirectly used.

4. Must we then discuss all these?

No: but prepare for them as they arise by arming our minds with the conviction that the wise though unfathomable counsel of a Personal God is in course of accomplishment.

5. Why is counsel used and not decrees?

Because the idea of determinate decree is not consistent with that of providence, as we understand it.

Reverence would accept the word decree, if the Supreme used it; but He does not use it, nor does it belong to the three elect words which make up our doctrine. The representatives of God on earth issue decrees; God Himself issues them to the forces and ordinances of the universe; but His purpose finds other terms when addressing the subjects of His moral government.

IV.

Historical Discussions.

1. What is the range of human speculation on these subjects?

It includes the greatest questions of all ages: the relation of God to creation and providence has been the problem of science and philosophy since they began.

2. How may we attempt to classify these speculations?

Not by tracing them historically; since the very same errors appear in every age with different names and forms. They may be reduced to three: (1) those which have held a kind of providence without creation; (2) those which have asserted a creation and rejected providence; and (3) those which have ignored both creation and providence.

3. What systems of thought have represented the first?

(1) Those which belong to what has been called DUALISM. In the Iranian or Persian religion the idea of two independent eternal principles was predominant: presiding over two worlds of spirit and matter. But in the conflict of these powers lay the idea of providence, controlling the evil.

(2) POLYTHEISM falls under the same category. The innumerable gods of almost every system of antiquity were the personifications of the forces of nature: expressing in this way the conception of a manifold providence of one God over all.

(3) In the refined philosophy of Greece, Plato and Aristotle represented the idea of a Divine providence, or soul in the world, moulding uncreated matter.

(4) Much modern scientific thought runs in that direction: substituting for creation an eternal something without name, and for providence an immanent force without reason. The

Positivists and Agnostics may be reckoned among them ; so far as they deny creation by pronouncing the beginning of anything unthinkable, and accept a kind of providence disguised under the irrational conception of immanent cause.

4. But do not these renounce both creation and providence ?

It must be admitted that they disavow both in their Christian meaning; but, while they deny that anything can come from nothing, they are obliged to confess in the system of things all the ideas that belong to providence : ends contemplated ; ends provided for ; ends surely attained. Our word they deny, but they "ignorantly worship" the thing.

5. What is the unreason of the phrase "immanent cause" ?

Cause must be independent of the thing affected by it, and cannot be inherent. Similarly, there can be no law without an independent being who acts according to it.

6. How is creation without providence represented ?

By those systems, ancient and modern, which admit the being of God as the Cause and Source of all things ; but deny the proper notion of His providence.

(1) Epicurus in antiquity denied that the gods were troubled with the government of the world they created.

(2) English Deists taught the same thing, when they insisted that God revealed Himself only in general laws.

(3) Many Christian advocates of Evolution are in danger of the same error. They think that it is more honourable to the Creator to represent Him as having impressed on the original germ a tendency to develop according to certain determinate laws, the slow operation of which produces all the variety of the universe, than to make His power a force interposing occasionally. Providence in this theory is stripped of its middle term ; the design and the accomplishment being retained, but the intermediate wisdom being absent.

7. May evolution be made consistent with our doctrine ?

The scriptural account of the secondary creation or formation of all things combines creation and providence : there are the creative epochs, in the intervals of which providence works

ceaselessly by the development of types. Natural selection, heredity, and the survival of the best types are terms which are all but used in the scriptures: the middle one is used. Under the seventh secular day of Moses we now live: there is no longer creative intervention; but the Creator still works in a regular development which preserves the original types.

John v. 17.

8. Does not science demand far more than this?

Yes; but without justifying its demand. All the evidence is in favour of certain breaks in the continuity; and one breach overturns the theory, so far as it ascribes all phenomena to evolution. The molecular arrangement of atoms, man now what he ever has been, and the persistence of the self-conscious thinking ego, are three facts to which no bridge leads.

9. What theories abolish both creation and providence?

Only two, absolutely and wholly, Pantheism and Materialism: the former the grandest, the latter the most grovelling, delusion of the human mind.

10. What is the position of Pantheism to the question?

It is a refuge from the difficulty of supposing aught to be outside of the infinite Being: therefore it makes God all. One eternal Is admits no creation, no providence.

(1) Ancient pantheistic systems fell far short of this idea: they supposed an infinite One from whom the universe emanated as a transient illusion to return to his abyss.

(2) Pantheism proper is a growth of modern times. In the mysticism of the middle ages, and in modern absolute Idealism, it repeats the ancient oriental type. But in Spinoza it takes its most consistent form: mathematically demonstrated and yet contradicted by the primary instincts of consciousness.

11. What is the position of Materialism?

As pantheism makes God all, so materialism makes matter all. Speculation about creation and its cause, about thought and its dignity, about everything outside of man, is only itself matter in a peculiar manifestation. There is no argument against a system which suppresses the first conditions of argument.

BOOK IV.

Sin.

I. SIN, GUILT, PUNISHMENT.

II. ORIGINAL SIN.

III. HISTORICAL THEORIES.

Chapter I.

Sin, Guilt, Punishment.

§ 1. Sin.

1. What is sin?

The voluntary separation of the soul or the self from God. That is the ultimate mystery of sin; but the Scriptural definition, leaving that deep mystery untouched, describes it generally in its manifestation as disobedience to the Divine will.

2. What does this presuppose in the creature?

Personality, which means a self-conscious, self-determining, and, in the creature, responsible agent.

3. What does it presuppose in the Creator?

That He places His creature in a state of probation or test, with freedom of will: this not being the liberty of indifference, as if hovering between two objects of choice; but the perfect freedom of union with God's will, with the mysterious possibility of becoming an independent spring of action.

4. What is the specific relation of sin to God?

As to His moral government and law it is disobedience; and as to His nature it is ungodliness or unholiness. There is no third relation to God conceivable.

5. Is this distinction seen in the names given to sin?

To the former class belong one series of terms, such as transgression, rebellion, lawlessness, iniquity; and to the latter another, such as godlessness, defilement, selfishness or selfhood, and evil generally. These run as two streams through the Bible

6. Has sin an analogous relation to the creature?

As it is his revolt against Divine law, it is the act of his creaturely will; as it is separation from God Himself, it becomes a state of man's sinful nature Hence it is always to be predicated of the act or of the character.

7. What is the leading definition of man's sin in Scripture?

The final, and as it were generic term is ἁμαρτία, sin as not attaining a mark prescribed; *All have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God.* But the last definition is that *Sin is lawlessness;* and *Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness,* τὴν ἀνομίαν: here to be without law is to be against law.

Rom. iii. 23.
1 John iii. 4.

8. Where then is the seat of sin to be first sought?

In the will which governs the act of the person.

9. Is this a full account of the seat of sin?

No: the will is only the executive of the personality of the man. He is the sinner; *the things which proceed out of the mouth*—and also the will—*come forth out of the heart,* whence are all the manifestations of evil, in the mind and in the affection as well as in the will.

Matt. xv. 18.

10. What effect has this on the doctrine of sin?

It reminds us that, besides the direct act which is sin, the nature of the man who sins may be sinful apart from the act.

11. What is the relation between the act and the character in sin?

The act forms the character; yet out of the character the act springs. Hence there is a mutual relation. But it is important to remember that sin may exist without any overt act: God alone sees the distinction, and knows the latent sin.

12. But how could sin arise in the heart of a creature formed by God in His own image?

That is the mystery of the origin of evil, which it is not possible for the finite mind to fathom.

13. Is there any difference between sin and evil?

Sin is the cause of evil; but the effect is wider than the cause. Evil is the opposite of that good which is the harmony of the universal creation of God and the blessedness of the intelligent creature. There was evil before human sin: the sin of man gave him *the knowledge of good and evil* as a distinction already existing. Gen. iii. 5.

14. How may the distinction be referred to human sin?

As man's sin is separation from God its effect is evil or misery; as it is transgression of His law it is the guilt that causes the evil, or rather explains and justifies its infliction.

§ 2. Guilt.

1. What is guilt?

Sin as objectively reckoned by God to the sinner, and subjectively reckoned by the sinner to himself.

2. How is this related to conscience?

Conscience is the faculty that unites God's imputation of sin and man's own in one. "I did it," first; and, then, "I must answer for it:" these two being undistinguishable.

3. What does this conscience, or moral consciousness, presuppose?

That on the mind, or reason, of the personality created in the image of God, there is engraven the everlasting principle of obligation to the Divine law.

4. But is not this itself the conscience?

No: conscience is not, strictly, the faculty that discerns between right and wrong, though this meaning is generally attached to the word. It is man's privity to himself, or with himself, συνειδήσις, as to his own conformity to the law otherwise given. *They show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing.* Rom. ii. 15.

5. Are sin and guilt or the conscience of sin inseparable?

These are joined together by the ordinance of God; but there is a distinction in guilt which modifies this.

6. What is that distinction?

Guilt is the imputation of the act, and the sinner guilty of the fault, which is REATUS CULPÆ; and it is the imputation of the consequences, and the sinner guilty as to the consequences, which is REATUS PŒNÆ

7. How is this distinction preserved in the terminology?

(1) The sinner is guilty, or αἴτιος, having in himself the αἰτία, or cause, of his sin. *They found no cause*, or *charge*, or *guilt, of death in Him.* (2) He is guilty, or ἔνοχος, obnoxious to judgment: as in *Guilty of an eternal sin*, or *In danger of eternal condemnation*, and *In danger of the judgment.*

Acts xiii. 28. Mark iii. 29. Matt. v. 21.

8. Are the guilt of the act and the guilt of the consequences always united?

Apart from the economy of redemption they are; but that economy introduces a great modification.

9. How may that be seen?

In the doctrine of Original Sin, where those are guilty as to the consequences of the act who were not guilty of the act of Adam. In the doctrine of the Atonement, where One is guilty of death who is not guilty of sin. And in the doctrine of Justification, where the guilt of the sin is no longer imputed, but some of the consequences still follow.

§ 3. Punishment.

1. What is punishment in relation to evildoing or sin?

The infliction of penalty on the sinner in vindication of the law: that is, of the dignity of the God of law.

2. What principles are here guarded?

That punishment is inflicted in requital of offence and is

not merely a natural consequence of sin; that it is a vindication or avenging of dishonour done to the Lawgiver, and not merely for the protection of moral order in the universe.

3. How does Scripture express these two points?

Vengeance (ἐκδίκησις) *is Mine, I will recompense* (ἀνταποδώσω), *saith the Lord*: the former as to God; the latter as to man; and together speaking of strict retribution. Rom. xii. 19.

4. Is not separation from God the sole and sufficient punishment of sin?

Yes: for as man's will separating himself from God is sin, so the punishment of sin is God's will separating man from Himself. But that is not a full account of the matter.

5. What then is wanting to it?

It forgets that God is more than the Supreme Good, separation from Whom is the consequence of sin. He is also the Moral Governor of the universe, Whose sacred order must be maintained. The term punishment, like the term guilt, strictly belongs to the province of God's rectoral justice

6. Is it not enough to say that sin is its own punishment?

It is true that the misery of sin and a guilty conscience is punishment. But it is not true that God punishes sin by further sin: on the one hand this supposition is inconsistent with the Divine attributes; and, on the other, it confounds two things that differ, sin and the punishment which results.

7. What is the other extreme?

To say that punishment is only or mainly correction.

8. How are we guarded against this error?

The term παιδεία, correction or *chastening*, always connotes the purpose of bringing the sinner to repentance, or of disciplining God's children not yet wholly delivered from sin. Punishment as such has no such design: the terms expressing it, such as death, destruction, imply a totally different purpose. Heb. xii. 7.

9. What then is punishment in the teaching of the Bible?

The manifestation of the wrath of God, which is the expression of His holiness and justice: not for the amendment of the sinner but for the vindication of the law against him, *against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.*

Rom. i. 18.

10. What is the proper punishment of sin inflicted by the Divine wrath?

The supreme and only punishment threatened against sin is death: the death of the sinning soul.

11. Is this death the extinction of the soul?

Assuredly not: the condemned spirits exist still; and it is *everlasting punishment* that is threatened against obdurate human sinners. There is no word for extinction in the Bible.

Matt. xxv. 46.

12. Do we not read that the first threatening was that of physical and temporal death?

Yes, but not of that only. Physical death is a subordinate form of the punishment, pertaining only to embodied spirits; and it has nothing to do with the punishment of sin in the abstract, or is only an accident of it.

13. What means then the classification of death as temporal, spiritual and eternal?

That belongs to the doctrine of sin as connected with the economy of human redemption: that is, to Original Sin.

14. Must we not think of degrees of sin and punishment?

These also must be deferred to a later stage: we have to do only with sin and death in their principles.

15. But is not this whole doctrine inconsistent with the infinite love of God?

God only can say what is consistent with His love. But we must remember: (1) That these truths run through revelation; (2) that they are reflected in the constitution of nature, and in the human conscience, as also in the courts of human law which are the reflection of the Divine (*I have*

said, Ye are gods); and (3) that, so far as the race of mankind is concerned, they are to be studied at the foot of the cross. *Who knoweth the power of Thine anger?* Ps. lxxxii. 6. Ps. xc. 11.

16. How does this last text bear on the whole question?

The Divine anger is a power (ὀργή) infinite as His being; the calamities of mortals are only finite expressions of its irresistible force; but the fulness of His displeasure shall never be known by those who fear God. To them both sin and the punishment of sin are abolished.

17. What is the relation of the cross to the subject?

(1) It gives the most awful proof of the severity of the Divine wrath against sin.

(2) It proves also that the expression of that wrath cannot be merely for chastisement or correction: this could not be vicarious, though punishment may in a certain sense be so.

(3) The solemn declaration is that *Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us.* And *Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.* With these we must compare the two parallel revelations of wrath and righteousness in the forefront of the Epistle to the Romans. Gal. iii. 13. 2 Cor. v. 21. Rom. i. 17, 18.

18. How does the constitution of nature illustrate it?

Innumerable calamities assert that there is an anger abroad in the universe which is not simply designed for correction.

19. And how the human conscience?

By the inextinguishable sentiment that connects wrong-doing with the desert of due punishment. That wrath which is *revealed from heaven* may be said also to be revealed within the human heart: the true voice of man's conscience for ever acknowledges the righteousness of the Divine anger. Rom. i. 18.

CHAPTER II.

Original Sin.

1. What is meant by Original Sin?

This expression—not found in Scripture—defines sin in its relation to the human race as such. It is the fault and corruption of mankind shared by every individual naturally born into it: the word "naturally" excluding only One.

2. What is the force of the term Original?

It refers simply and solely to the derivation of mankind from a common stock. Our first parents, created without sin, nevertheless transmitted sin to their posterity, who inherit the consequences of their first fault.

3. In what sense may sin be transmitted?

The human nature propagated is sinful as alienated from the Divine law and from the Divine holiness.

4. How is the fault or culpa transmitted?

Only in the second sense of guilt: the REATUS PŒNÆ, or liability to endure the consequences of sin.

5. How is the corruption transmitted?

Only in the second sense of nature, or its moral tendency: this being contrary to the Divine nature.

6. What definition of original sin is thus gained?

It is the transmission of hereditary guilt and depravity from Adam to all his descendants.

7. But did the just and merciful God permit Adam's race to continue only under these hard conditions?

No: He placed mankind under a covenant of grace through a Mediator to be revealed in the fulness of time.

8. How does this affect our definition?

Original sin is the transmission of guilt and depravity under a constitution of grace.

9 This being understood, what are the elements of our doctrine?

(1) The original sin; (2) original sin under the covenant of grace; and (3) original sin in its developments as actual sin.

§ 1. The Original Sin.

1. What is meant by this term and expression?

The first sin of Adam and the fall of man.

2. How are these two ideas united?

Adam was the natural head and representative and sum of mankind: so that his sin and his fall were the sin and the fall of the human race.

3. In what sense was this by imputation?

Imputation has two meanings: the reckoning to the agent his own act, and in this sense his sin was imputed to Adam; also the reckoning to another the consequences of an act not his own, and in this sense Adam's act is reckoned to his descendants in common with himself.

4. How can we meet the preliminary objection of reason to such a transference?

In three ways: (1) the whole economy of redemption is based upon this second kind of imputation; (2) it has its analogy in all the providential dealings of God with man; and (3) in the profound mystery of our relation to Adam our individual personality is not really separate from his.

5. What is the theological expression of this?

Adam was the natural and federal head of the race.

6. How are we to understand this covenant of federal headship?

(1) The word covenant means generally a Divine disposi-

tion or order or arrangement ; and in this sense Adam was as a creature placed under a covenant which included his posterity in him. But (2) the word covenant is throughout Scripture connected with sacrifice and a Mediator ; in this sense Adam was not placed under a covenant.

7. Then the Paradisaical Covenant of Works is not meant?

No such covenant with Adam as the surety for his posterity is mentioned in Scripture. Apart from the unrevealed Mediator, he is dealt with as an individual creature of God. The first of all covenants is in Christ.

8. Does the narrative of Genesis sustain this view?

(1) The record itself indirectly suggests it in two ways. The name Adam signifies Man : the punishment expressly refers to the sorrows of human birth ; and the promise connected with it embraces the seed and posterity of the woman. Thus the unity of the race in Adam is affectingly bound up with a coming redemption.

(2) But that narrative has the light of the New Testament thrown upon it ; and in that light we see that Another joined him in suretyship for the coming race.

9. What bearing has this on the probation of man?

The narrative of the fall describes the issues of a trial under which Adam failed. But it also describes the process of probation as continued under other conditions for mankind. The probation of Adam is the continuous probation of man : in his case it was conducted with reference to a coming Redeemer, in ours with reference to One Who has come.

10. How is the process of the fall described?

A positive law was given, with its sanction ; temptation from without, or probationary trial, was ordained of God and permitted to Satan ; the sinless will was free, or under no restraint ; and sin appeared in human nature as disobedience.

11. What is meant here by the sinless will being free?

The sinlessness of the will was its being one with the will

of God, and therefore not yet a personal self-determination. But there was in it the possibility of becoming the will of self, independent of God.

12. What principles must we bring to the study of these points?

We must remember (1) that a state of things is described of which we who read have no experience, and the whole is the revelation of a mystery to us unfathomable; (2) that all is set forth in the language with which our experience has made us familiar, and the first sinners are presented to us as if tempted and falling like ourselves; (3) that the grace of redemption and the coming of a future trial are bound up with the whole narrative; and (4) that the history of real facts is also the history of symbolic facts: every incident in the record is connected with outward signs having their spiritual meaning.

13. Is not this very much like the allegorical or mythical interpretation?

Allegory teaches truth through parable not based on fact. Myth invents both the truth taught and the history that teaches it. Here we have a true history bound up with symbols which must be spiritually discerned.

14. What obliges us to hold fast the truth of the history?

(1) The record of Beginnings in Genesis requires it: as symbolical teaching is based on history in the first chapter so it is in the second.

(2) The New Testament treats the narrative as historical. Our Lord assumes this when he says, *He which made them at the beginning, made them male and female*, and speaks of the *Murderer from the beginning*. So does St. Paul when he says that *the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty*, and throughout his doctrine of original sin and death.

Matt. xix. 4.
John viii. 44.
2 Cor. xi. 3.

15. How may we understand the positive law and its sanction?

(1) The law of God was engraven on the heart of man, but not as law proper: the one positive or special commandment was a test of obedience. Thus it pleased God that His

creatures should in one sense already know the distinction of good and evil.

(2) *The tree of the knowledge of good and evil* was both law and sanction of law. Sanction means the protection thrown around commandment, whether by promise or threatening; but the deterrent sanction alone was necessary, and that took the form of prediction, *Thou shalt surely die.*

Gen. ii. 17.
Gen. ii. 17.

(3) To abstain from the tree would be obedience: the knowledge of good as good. To eat of it would be disobedience, and bring the conscious knowledge of evil too. Before eating, the knowledge was theoretical; afterwards it was practical.

16. How is temptation from without described?

(1) Man had no sinful ἐπιθυμία, or lust, by which he might be *drawn away and enticed:* only innocent desire for spiritual and sensuous gratification which might become sinful, the natural concupiscence which might turn to *evil concupiscence* (ἐπιθυμίαν κακήν).

Jas. i. 14.
Col. iii. 5.

(2) The tempter, Satan, himself the original sinner, was permitted to assail that innocent desire, whether spiritual or sensuous: the former by urging *Ye shall be as gods;* the latter by acting on the desire to eat the forbidden fruit.

Gen. iii. 5.

17. Can we understand the process of interior temptation?

We cannot; since the only temptation of which we have experience assails a mother lust already in man, *his own lust.* Our Lord, without that lust, was tempted; but He could not sin, being the Son of God. It is vain therefore to speculate as to a mystery which is unfathomable. Suffice that the mystery stands revealed before us: fact shows that the creature may come to a guilty consciousness of a self separated from God.

Jas. i. 14.

18. What was the resulting sin?

(1) In its hidden secret the sin began in listening to another than God; from that moment Satan became virtually the god of this world.

(2) As we see its working, it was first sensual, *The tree was good for food* and *pleasant to the eyes:* and then spiritual, it was *to be desired to make one wise.*

Gen. iii. 6

(3) But in both *the spirit of the mind* must have been then as always, the seat of the transgression. Eph. iv. 23

19 In what sense was this the fall of man?

(1) It was active, first as internal and then as external: παρακοή, disobedience. And passive, a fall from the estate of life into that of death: παράπτωμα, in the original meaning of that word.

20. Is the beginning of human sin called in Scripture the fall?

Indirectly it is. St. Paul teaches that *By the trespass of the one the many died.* Rom. v. 15. In the apocryphal book of Wisdom this word is translated fall: Wisdom is said Wisd. x. 1. to have "preserved the first formed (or protoplast) father of the world, and brought him out of his fall." In both places the word is παράπτωμα.

21. Why then have we spoken of the fall of man or mankind?

(1) Because Adam, the first man, was the natural head of the human race; even as Christ, the last Adam, is its spiritual head.

(2) Eve *being beguiled fell in the transgression*, received the first doom and the first promise. She was only 1 Tim. ii. 14. *the mother of all living*, but Adam was the father and Gen. iii. 20. representative of all.

22. What was the immediate consequence of the fall?

(1) Man died by separation from God: a mystery known in its effects; (2) he felt the *sting of death* which is 1 Cor. xv. 56. the conscience of sin; (3) he fell under the bondage Heb. ii. 14. of Satan, who *had the power of death;* (4) and his moral nature became disordered: so that his spirit became enslaved to the flesh, and the world over which he was to rule began to rule over him.

§ 2. Original Sin under the Covenant of Grace.

1. What is conveyed by this theme?

That the transmission of sin to the race must at all points

be studied in connection with the great provision for its removal, counteraction, or mitigation.

2. How may the general principles of this connection be established?

By combining and weighing many particulars, first in the history of the fall, and secondly in the New-Testament explanation of it: the latter having preeminence.

3. What indications have we in the early narrative?

(1) The judgments threatened or predicted were evidently arrested. Though man's body was *dead because of sin*, that death was only a coming evil; though his soul was *alienated from the life of God*, God came to the sinner and still communed with him; though he fell under the bondage of Satan, he heard it said to Satan, *It*—the seed of the woman—*shall bruise thy head;* though he found the earth outside different from the garden whence he was driven, it was yet to sustain the life that was already redeemed.

Rom. viii. 10
Eph. iv. 18.
Gen. iii. 15.

(2) While the religious history of Adam and Eve is passed over, we see that the worship of God by sacrifice enters into the narrative as an established fact and runs on unbroken. In short, a new method of approach to the Divine Being glides blessedly into the outer world of man's banishment.

Gen. iv. 3.

(3) Thus an unrevealed Saviour seems to intercept the full effects of sin: coming in as it were between the fall and the propagation of the fallen race.

4. What is the teaching of the New Testament?

(1) Generally that Adam was the type of *Him that was to come:* not the type of WHAT should come to his posterity, but a personal type of a personal Antitype.

Rom. v. 14.

(2) The original transgression and death its penalty are revealed in their full spiritual meaning.

(3) Every description of original sin as such and every allusion to it is, without exception, connected more or less directly with the grace of the atonement.

(4) The symbols of the garden of probation have their

interpretation : *The tree of life*, and *That old serpent, called the devil and Satan*, especially. We gather that the tree of life was the sign or sacrament of immortality; and that exclusion from it shut the human race up to another way of life. Rev. ii. 7. Rev. xii. 9.

5. What is the doctrine of the two Adams?

Strictly speaking, there is no such doctrine in Scripture St. Paul once calls the Redeemer *the last Adam*, as distinguished from *the first man Adam:* and this in reference to the resurrection. *The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is of heaven.* Comparing this with other teaching, theology has made Adam and Christ two several heads. 1 Cor. xv. 45 47.

6. How far does the parallel hold?

(1) If *in the Christ*, the last Adam at the end of the race, *all shall be made alive*, even as *in Adam*, at the beginning of the race, *all die*, the two heads must each include all mankind. 1 Cor. xv. 22.

(2) But, while the race receives some benefit from its better Head, He is really the Father only of a new humanity, spiritually and not naturally receiving life from Him. And it is the relation between that universal benefit and this more limited one which concerns the doctrine of original sin.

Original Condemnation as under Grace.

7. How is original sin as universal condemnation connected with the first and the second man?

St. Paul, in what may be called the classical chapter on the subject of sin, unfolds its genesis in the following way:

(1) In a fivefold gradation, he traces it to Adam. *Through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and* so *death passed unto all men, for that* (or, *on the ground that*) *all sinned.* They did not die for their own sin, yet sin was imputed to them in its consequences *from Adam unto Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression.* More specifically, *by the trespass of the one the many died;* and still more so, *the judgment came of one unto condemnation.* And that condemnation was death Rom. v. 12 —19.

in full sway: *by one man's offence death reigned by one.* And upon all the race: *by the offence of one it came upon all men to condemnation:* and many were *made sinners.*

(2) Beginning with the second of the five, St. Paul introduces *Him that was to come*, and *the gift by the grace of the* ONE MAN; which came *of many trespasses unto justification*, or an act of original righteousness parallel with original condemnation; through which they that make it their own *shall reign in life by One, Jesus Christ.* For *by the obedience of One shall*, in this higher sense, *many be made righteous.*

Rom. v. 14—19.

(3) And all this follows a fourfold description of the character of universal sin as in man, each description being connected with the atonement: *While we were yet* WEAK, *in due season Christ died for the* UNGODLY. *While we were yet* SINNERS *Christ died for us. While we were* ENEMIES, *we were reconciled to God.* The cross is in the middle of the four.

Rom. v. 6, 8, 10.

(4) Throughout the whole THE GIFT *by the* GRACE *of the One Man* reigns and governs the doctrine. The GRACE is the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness at the beginning of the world; and the GIFT, the Free Gift, is that grace in its first and most universal form.

Rom. v. 15.

8. Is this doctrine of original condemnation and grace taught only by St. Paul and in this chapter alone?

Formally it is here alone; but then it is taught as the foundation of the entire fabric of the atonement.

9. What effect has this combination on our doctrine?

It is relieved of an apparent inconsistency with the Divine justice; the condemnation to the evils of mortality is not connected with final condemnation; God is not seen to be reconciling Himself to the world but the world to Himself; no one is eternally punished for the sin of Adam; and every penitent believer is assured of a more abundant blessing than was forfeited by his first parent.

10. Why then should the definition of original sin preserve the element of a rescinded hereditary condemnation?

Because the vicariousness and universality of Christ's redeeming work both demand its clear assertion.

Original Depravity not under Grace.

11. How is original sin as depravity connected with the first and the second man?

Not so directly as its condemnation; but it is everywhere presupposed in Scripture that the effect of the atonement saved the nature of man from utter ruin.

12. What are the Scriptural testimonies that lead to this?

They may be classed under three heads: (1) those which represent the benefit of the atonement as provided before sin began; (2) those which speak of Christ as the light of all men; and (3) those which expressly refer to an influence of the Holy Spirit as striving with man from the beginning.

13. Show the bearing of the first.

It is said that the sacrificial Lamb was *foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world*, and *slain from the foundation of the world*. The benefit of the atonement is twofold as it respects the world: as a propitiation it abolished the condemnation of the race, and as an atonement or reconciliation it procured the Spirit of grace. 1 Peter i. 20. Rev. xiii. 8.

14. May we call this a restoration of the Spirit?

It is better to say that the Spirit was not totally withdrawn. The Son, in whose image man was made, did not leave the race, though He is said to be a Gift to man. So the Spirit did not leave the race, though He also is said to be a Gift. The *gift* (δωρεά) applies to both, though in this passage it refers rather to release from condemnation. John iii. 16, iv. 10. John vii. 39. Rom. v. 15—17.

15. What evidence do we find in the history of the fall?

The consciousness of guilt in our first parents was also the sense of shame: *they knew that they were naked* and *hid themselves*. This does not permit the thought of an entire death of the spiritual nature: shame is the dawn of repentance. Gen. iii. 7, 8.

16. What in the early development of sin?

We see that, though *every imagination of the thoughts of*

his heart was only evil continually, yet the Spirit of God strove with the sinner: *My Spirit shall not always judge in man; in their wandering they are flesh.* Here it is probable that the flesh has the full meaning which our Saviour gave it.

Gen. vi. 5, 3.

17. And what in general allusions to original depravity in the Old Testament?

Two may here stand for many: that of Job, *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one;* and that of David, *In sin did my mother conceive me.* But these and all like them make inbred sin ground of appeal to the mercy of God, as if the very depravity had a claim upon compassion.

Job. xiv. 4. Ps. li. 5.

18. What is the Saviour's testimony above referred to?

(1) *That which is born of the flesh is flesh.* Here we must note two things: that original depravity is called the flesh as in the beginning of human history; and that our Lord introduces this inherited bias only to parallel it with the new birth: *That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.* Thus, as we have seen that the testimonies to original condemnation are bound up with those of an original relief, so original depravity is bound up with original provision to neutralise it. (2) When our Lord said, *If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children*, He most clearly asserted both original sin and original grace in human nature.

John iii. 6. Matt. vii. 11.

19. What influence has this on the doctrine?

It shows that something is left in man for redemption to work upon; that the image of God was not entirely effaced; therefore that human nature must not be regarded as hopelessly corrupt; and that the will of man universal is under a measure of restraining and prompting and assisting grace.

20. What justifies our attributing this to the influence of the Holy Spirit?

He is and ever has been the Administrator of the mediatorial work of Christ; and as He is *the Spirit of grace* all tendencies to good must come from Him.

Heb. x. 29.

21. What light does this shed upon human nature?

It shows that it was not utterly marred; and explains how the *inward man* still remained, not without the germ of good. It accounts also for the Gentiles having *the work of the law written in their hearts*, and gives their true force to St. Paul's words: *though He be not far from each one of us.*

Rom. vii. 22. Rom. ii. 15. Acts xvii 27, 22.

22. How does it bear on the freedom of the will?

The freedom of the will, strictly speaking, was unaffected by the fall; though as a tendency of the will towards good it ceased. But the coming recovery gave to the will a secret bias towards good as lost, impressed on it a certain restraint from evil, and bestowed a measure of power to seek recovery.

23. What terms are used in the New Testament to define original sin as depravity?

Sin generally, as when this is said to have *reigned in death;* but it is spoken of by St. Paul as *My flesh*, or the *Law in my members*, or *The carnal mind.* It is not selfishness, nor the old man: the former is a manifestation of the flesh, and the latter connotes figuratively its growth to maturity.

Rom. v 21. Rom. vii. 23. Rom. viii. 7.

24. Then the flesh is the main definition?

Yes, the flesh has two meanings in Scripture: human nature as in the body of transitoriness, and in that sense our Saviour *partook of the same;* human nature as swayed by sin, and our Lord came only *in the likeness of sinful flesh.*

Heb. ii. 14. Rom. viii. 3.

§ 3. Original and Actual Sin.

1. What is the relation between these?

Original sin, as the inborn bias, is the source of all the particular sins of mankind and all forms of sinful habit.

2. How are we taught to understand original sin as existing before actual sin?

It is said to be present but latent until the law awakens it: there is a time when the moral consciousness of personality and of sinfulness awake together, the one never being regarded as without the other. The I and my guilt spring up as one.

3. How does St. Paul assert this?

In Romans vii., which contains as it were the history of sin in man, he says that he was *alive apart from the law* Rom. vii. 9. *once*, but *sin revived and I died. For through the* Rom. iii. 20. *law cometh the knowledge of sin:* in a certain sense this is as true in every man of his race as in Adam himself.

4. But does not this make the appearance of sin in the individual his own fall?

We are not to suppose that, as the condemnation of original sin is abolished by the atonement, so also the bias of it is destroyed. This is its mystery, that it lies in the nature ready to be revealed. No new fall is to be thought of.

5. This being the ultimate principle of sinful bias, what principles govern the various manifestations of it?

These arose under many influences. As the deep bias of sin comes from the more distant head of the race, so forms of that bias may be inherited from the more immediate progenitor. The individual constitution gives a character to individual sinfulness. So every position or course in life affects and directs its manifestations.

6. What are the leading classifications of actual sin?

Life is not more diversified than the sin of life. But there are certain principles of arrangement.

(1) As to the sinner himself, sin is of thought or word or act; and also of the flesh, as using the body, and of the spirit, as independent of the body.

(2) As to the object; sin is supremely against God, but also against the neighbour and against self.

(3) Viewed as to law, sin is of commission or omission; it is also voluntary or involuntary: this last being subdivided into sins of ignorance, precipitancy, and infirmity.

(4) In respect to temptation, sin is *the lust of the flesh*, or 1 John ii. 16. *the lust of the eyes*, or *the vainglory of life.*

7. What may be said of such a classification?

That all sins are manifestations of one and the selfsame

principle; that the several orders of sin are to be estimated by that and not by their apparent variations in evil; and finally, that such analyses are useful chiefly in Christian ethics.

8. What is the Scriptural doctrine as to the degrees of sin?

In both Testaments degrees of guilt are recognised: (1) in the Old, we read of secret sins and presumptuous sins; of sins for which atonement was accepted and of sins for which the Levitical economy provided no remission. (2) In the New, our Lord speaks of the debtor of *five hundred pence* and of *fifty;* and, still more expressly, of him that had *the greater sin.* Luke vii. 41. John xix. 11.

9. How does the New Testament apply this truth?

(1) To show that Divine mercy, through the great atonement, extends to all transgression: the Divine charity that *shall cover a multitude of sins* as the pattern of the human. Jas. v. 20.

(2) To direct our thought to the one centre and source of all evil: the fountain which must be cleansed.

(3) To impress on us that, notwithstanding the tolerance of God, *whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all.* Jas. ii. 10.

10. What is taught as to the progress and stages of sin?

(1) That acts of transgression form the general character and specific habits: towards this every deed contributes, however insensibly, in those who become *accustomed to do evil.* Jer. xiii. 23.

(2) That resistance to grace strengthens the power to resist: till men become *branded in their own conscience* and *always resist the Holy Ghost.* 1 Tim. iv. 2. Acts vii. 51.

(3) Sin then becomes either insensibility or hypocrisy or blasphemy: three stages, or different forms of the final stage, which are distinguished in Scripture. The first denotes that the heart is *hardened by the deceitfulness of sin;* the second, that indifference to Divine things makes a pretence to honour them; and the third utters the feeling of the heart in impious contempt of God and religion. Heb. iii. 13.

(4) And these issue in what the Scriptures call hardening

or reprobation; which is the anticipation in this world of the final sentence: sin and punishment united in one.

11. What is the extreme form of reprobation?

The sentence, already passed, upon the sin against the Holy Ghost: as that sin is generally called which is thrice in the New Testament excluded from hope.

(1) By our Saviour, who says: *Whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin.* This is the rejection of the last and clearest manifestation of God the Holy Trinity.

Mark iii. 29.

(2) In the Epistle to the Hebrews those who do not *press on unto perfection*, but reject the Saviour and *put Him to an open shame*, are for ever unforgiven, because *there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins:* they renounce the only refuge.

Heb. vi. 1, 6, x. 26.

(3) And therefore, in St. John's language, they commit *a sin unto death*, for which the apostle does not exhort us to pray.

1 John v 16.

12. Is such a sin consistent with probation under the infinite mercy of God?

In each instance the sin is supposed to shut itself from mercy. But no man can commit this last offence who dreads it or fears that he has committed it.

13. What is the character of sin in the regenerate?

Strictly speaking, it is reduced to original sin: for *whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin.* That original sin is THE FLESH which, in its first expression of itself, *lusteth against the Spirit;* but the regenerate have *crucified the flesh, with the passions and the lusts thereof;* and this gives their sin a peculiar character and aggravation. But for such sins there is a special intercession: *We have an Advocate with the Father.*

1 John iii. 9. Gal. v. 17, 24. 1 John ii. 1.

14. How are actual sins effectually done away?

Only by the removal of the sin that is behind all.

15. Meanwhile is sin imputed to the regenerate?

There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are

in Christ Jesus. But the evil that remains "hath of itself the nature of sin," requiring the constant virtue of the blood which *cleanseth us from all sin*, and the constant exercise of penitence. Rom. viii. 1. 1 John i. 7.

§ 4. Historical.

1. What has been the current of thought concerning sin?

(1) It may be said that the evil affecting mankind has almost universally been felt as the consciousness of guilt; and that every language has in it something corresponding to our word sin. (2) That the thoughts of men have taken the form of inquiry concerning the secret of its origin and universality: in other words, concerning what we call Original Sin.

2. How is this illustrated by the leading theories of sin?

(1) In the systems outside of revelation, and in speculations independent of Christian teaching, there have been two prominent modes of thought, one generally called Pantheistic and the other Dualistic: both accounting for the origin of evil.

(2) And most of the controversies within the Christian Church have had to do with the relations of the first offence of Adam to the transgressions of his posterity.

3. What may be said as to the Oriental ideas of sin?

The Indian religions are not strictly Pantheistic in their conceptions; since evil is always regarded as something in the creature that separates from God and must be purged out in successive stages of existence. The Zend or Persian Dualism, which asserted two eternal principles, embodied in Ormuzd (Ahura-Mazda) and Ahriman (Angro-Mainyus), taught rigorously the evil of sin and in some sense its final suppression.

4. How does modern Pantheism view sin?

It holds that evil is a necessary evolution of the one eternal substance; that it springs from the limitation of the creature as a fleeting manifestation of the infinite; and that it is not personal guilt, but a process towards good.

5. How has the Dualistic view appeared in Christianity?

(1) In the Gnostic heresies which made matter the seat of evil: its last form was Manichæism.

(2) In all those ancient and modern theories which have regarded man's sensuous nature as the seat of sin.

(3) In certain notions of the transmission of evil bias in the soul only, the spotless spirit being infused by God.

(4) And in the widespread opinion that until death the flesh must needs be a body of sin: a relic of Gnosticism.

6. What was the general testimony of pagan writers?

In all the best writings of antiquity there is the acknowledgment that "no one is born without sin," and no one without some seed of good. Moreover, the idea is often expressed that man has degenerated from a better condition.

7. And what was that of the Judaism of the Interval?

It preserved the tradition that "the first man was the cause of death to all his descendants": in the later Rabbinism "Adam postremus est Messias."

8. How was the doctrine of sin held in the early church?

During the first three centuries there was no difference of opinion as to the universality of sin. The relation of original sin to Adam was not much discussed; but two currents of thought as to inborn depravity began to set in.

9. What form did this variation assume?

The churches almost universally held that the fall left some remainder of good on which "internal prevenient grace" might work. This was regarded as the preservation of free-will: without discussing the nature of will and its freedom. The Eastern churches held rather more strongly than the Western that man has the power to co-operate with grace. The two tendencies found their issue in the Pelagian controversy.

10. Meanwhile, what other discussions tended to this issue?

Three theories of the origin of the human spirit which divided opinion down to the middle ages:

(1) That of the Preexistence of spirits, their preadamite fall, and entrance into earthly life for purgation, as taught by Origen in connection with universal restoration.

(2) Creationism: namely, that each spirit is created and infused into a human soul, deriving a taint from the union.

(3) That of Traducianism: the propagation of the entire man, body and soul and spirit, according to the mysterious law of God under which the first man was formed.

11. How did these affect our doctrine?

(1) The first would make every sinner in the world responsible for his original sin. (2) The second favoured the mitigating theories of depravity: making it evil rather than sin. But it involves, on the other hand, a very harsh imputation on the Divine justice. (3) The third is the only one which allows the thought of a human race, or mankind, viewed as a federal unity and corrupted once for all.

12. What were the issues of the Pelagian controversy?

(1) Pelagius taught that men are born in the state in which their first father was created; but with the influence of bad example and the solicitations of the flesh to fight against; that grace is no other than the natural bias to good, which the law and the example of Christ work upon; that man can of himself choose good and through discipline reach perfection.

(2) Augustin taught that all men "sinned in Adam," and in him or with him lost their freedom of will: that is, the will became determined only and necessarily to evil; this being both guilt and utter corruption.

(3) Semi-Pelagianism mediated: it introduced the thought that the fall only weakened the will and the power of men: the residue of good being sufficient to begin what grace brings to maturity. It regarded this grace, moreover, as universal.

13. Have those three types of doctrine continued?

The first has perhaps passed away, being held only by those who like Pelagius deny and reject the need of an atone-

ment. The second is held by the Calvinistic churches. The third, with modifications, is predominant.

14. What modifications?

Every doctrine of original sin has had to take account of that something in the nature of fallen man which shows that he is not totally and absolutely dead in separation from God. Semi-Pelagianism made the first attempt; every succeeding theory has more or less endeavoured to define the source, value, and limitations of that residue of good. To trace them is to trace the history of modern thought on sin.

15. What was the current of that tendency of thought before the Reformation?

(1) During the middle ages, most of the schoolmen taught that the original righteousness of man was a supernatural gift enabling him to keep the natural desires of the flesh under the control of the spirit; that by sin this restraint was lost; that this loss was original sin as condemnation, and as the weakening of the natural power; that in baptism the guilt is taken away, the concupiscence remaining but not reckoned as sin; and that grace is given before baptism by which the sinner may prepare himself for justification.

(2) The Council of Trent put this into its final form.

16. What in the Lutheran and Calvinistic Confessions?

They agreed at first in presenting an unmitigated dogma of original sin: as the condemnation of the race, and the total extinction of true spiritual life.

17. What controversy arose as to the transmission of guilt?

As to whether it must be traced IMMEDIATELY to the sin of Adam, or comes in MEDIATELY, on the supposition that the depravity brings or conditions the guilt.

18. How does this bear on our doctrine?

(1) In Predestinarianism, which assumes that there was

no redemption provided for part of the race, an immediate imputation is utterly repugnant to the mercy of God.

(2) As connected with the doctrine of universal redemption, immediate imputation is a necessary foundation for the universal original benefit of the atonement. Immediate and mediate imputation harmonise well: the former is neutralised by a free gift of righteousness to mankind; and the latter is the sin of his nature charged upon him who makes it his own.

19. What modification arose in Lutheranism?

Synergism—the doctrine of co-operation—or semi-Pelagianism, with one striking difference: the latter assigns to human will the first movement which grace afterwards helps; the former holds that grace begins what man must afterwards co-operate with. This view was condemned, but subsequently became prevalent as a protest against the extreme view of Flacius, that sin has become of the very nature of man.

20. How did Arminianism still further lighten the doctrine?

The Remonstrant Confession carefully defined the transmission of guilt as actually limited to the consequences of Adam's sin; it distinguished between depravity and sin proper; and ascribed the struggle between good and evil in the natural man to a universal grace of the Spirit of God.

21. Is the Methodist doctrine precisely the same?

In the last point it is. But in the two former it is more distinct: holding the transmission of guilt in full, though as counteracted by the atoning righteousness of the Second Adam; and affirming that the concupiscence of original sin is sin in reality, to be confessed as such and taken away by grace.

22. What less qualified developments of semi-Pelagianism are seen in modern theology?

An American school, mainly connected with the Oberlin university, teaches a doctrine which denies original sin altogether. It holds that there is no sin but in voluntary disobedience of a known law; and accounts for universal

depravity—if indeed universal—on the ground that the first exercises of the will are determined by sense.

23. What are the cardinal errors of this view?

(1) The undue prominence it gives to the human will as distinguished from the personality behind the will.

(2) The confusion between natural and moral ability.

(3) Its Pelagian denial of the federal connection of the race with its twofold head.

24. As to the second of these, what is its error?

It holds rightly that there is no liberty of indifference in the human will, which must be determined to good or evil; but inconsistently supposes that the beginning of sin is the election of self as the ultimate choice, and the beginning of regeneration its ultimate choice of universal benevolence.

25. What are our safeguards in studying this doctrine?

(1) It will be well to remember that the facts of human life and history confirm the doctrine both of a condemnation resting on the race, and of a depravity shared by every individual.

(2) Nothing is gained by limiting original sin to an inherited bias to evil: the atonement, as relieving from guilt and saving from spiritual impotence, cannot be divided.

(3) It is not supposed that sin is a new entity in the soul: the essentials of human nature are unimpaired.

(4) The redemption of the whole race, as determined before sin began and beginning with it, is the one solution given for our present estate of probation. The

Zech. xiii. 1. *Fountain opened* in Paradise itself *for sin and for uncleanness* may have two historical meanings given to it: one for the origin of the evil, the other for the origin of the remedy. But this leads to the next Book.

BOOK V.

The Mediatorial Work of the Redeemer.

I. THE REDEEMING PURPOSE OF THE TRIUNE GOD.
II. THE PERSON OF CHRIST.
III. THE MEDIATORIAL HISTORY.
IV. THE ATONEMENT.

BOOK V.

The Mediatorial Work of the Redeemer.

What is the general subject of this Book?

The whole ministry of the Incarnate Son as objectively undertaken and accomplished for the restoration of mankind.

2. What does the word Objectively here mark?

That we have to do with the Saviour's work as finished once for all on behalf of the human race: no reference being had to the benefits of this work as applied. But it is plain that the latter cannot be altogether excluded.

3. Show the propriety of the term Ministry.

Ministry is the word used by the Lord Himself: *The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.* Matt. xx. 28. It includes doing and suffering, both on earth and in heaven: which no other word does. But the Mediatorial Work is a more familiar phrase.

4. And that of the term Mediatorial.

It signifies that the whole intervention of Christ for man is to be regarded as that of a Mediator: One, however, who is not a third person between two others, but who is Himself the union of God and man. There is a restricted meaning of mediation which refers to the atoning part of Christ's work; but it is the wider meaning that is signified here.

5. How is the subject to be divided?

The most systematic treatment of it is the best. We may pass from stage to stage, thus: (1) the eternal purpose in the Trinity viewed here as redemptional, with its gradual accomplishment until the fulness of time; (2) the Person of the Christ who then appeared; (3) the estates and offices of the historical Redeemer; (4) the finished atonement.

Chapter I.

The Redeeming Purpose of the Triune God.

1. What is the meaning of this expression?

It is intended to signify that the whole work of Christ was the accomplishment of a decree that announced the purpose of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost to redeem the world: a purpose which is declared to have preceded the sin of man and to have been gradually revealed.

2. But may we presume to dwell on this apart from its accomplishment?

There is no topic in theology which scripture makes more prominent or more fundamental.

3. How is this seen?

In three ways: the purpose is described by various terms; this is connected with the three Persons of the Godhead; and its eternity is constantly dwelt on, or rather its being before time but in time made manifest.

§ 1. The Eternal Purpose or Decree.

1. Which of these words must be used?

Both: with a third added including counsel. *According to the purpose of Him who worketh all things according to the counsel of His will:* here we have θέλημα, decree; βουλή, deliberative counsel; πρόθεσις, purpose before the mind. These terms we may rearrange and transpose: their deep combined meaning is inexhaustible, and what is wanting in one is supplied by the others.

Eph. i. 11.

2. What is the result on our doctrine?

That redemption must be viewed as, equally with creation,

the pure expression of a Divine fiat: it was a purpose expressed in decree and accomplished by counsel.

3. Does this last refer to a plan of redemption?

No: that idea is what it means to avoid. We may speak of a plan of salvation, that is of an ORDO SALUTIS, or method of saving individuals; but not with the same propriety of a scheme or plan for saving mankind.

4. But does not this make the purpose too absolutely matter of will?

(1) The will is that of love: *God is love;* and He *so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son.* 1 John iv. 8. John iii. 16.

(2) *The determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God* only executed His *good pleasure* for the salvation of man. It has nowhere the character of an independent decree; but this word εὐδοκία goes on from beginning to end of the evangelical history, shedding a certain tender sympathy over the idea. Acts ii. 23. Eph. i. 9.

5. Is this last point literally and universally true?

There is no instance to the contrary. Every reference to the eternal counsel is connected with His love to the saved as men and as persons: absolute decree there is none.

6. Does not all this resolve the eternal decree rather into a purpose of grace to the elect than a purpose of salvation for all?

There is purpose of design (ἵνα) and purpose of result (ὥστε). Both are used of the philanthropy of God or His love to the race. But there is no doubt that the RESULT in the congregation of brethren gathered round the Eternal Son is generally spoken of as the DESIGN: believers are *foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son.* Rom. viii. 29.

§ 2. The Trinity of Redemption.

1. What means this expression here?

That the absolute Trinity is revealed to us as sustaining special relations to the redemption of mankind: relations

which have their beginning in the original purpose, and their full exhibition in its final accomplishment.

2. How their beginning in the original purpose?

There was in the most holy essence of the Three Persons a counsel of redemption, this being rightly understood: in which the Father's will is a good pleasure accepted by the Son, and a purpose to be accomplished by the Holy Ghost.

3. What means here the "rightly understood"?

The scriptures do not speak directly of this Triune counsel in that sense of a Covenant of Redemption according to which the Son undertook to save a portion of the race and had them given to Him as His reward: the Father being the originator of the covenant and the Holy Spirit its witness and administrator.

4. How is this error to be obviated?

By bearing three things always in mind. (1) That God is one in will and purpose and operation: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit each and severally represents the perfect Godhead. (2) That the object of the Divine purpose in redemption is the same man that was created by the Holy Trinity. (3) That the mysterious interior relations of the Triune God, for ever unfathomable to us, rendered it possible that each Person should have a distinct function in the salvation of the human race.

5. But is not theology here adventuring too highly?

By no means: since the entire revelation of Scripture marks out these distinctions in the clearest manner.

6. How then may we venture to express them?

That the Divine Personality of the Son, being eternally derived from the Father as the fountain of the Deity, could execute the Father's will or the will of God, in becoming incarnate; and that the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, could execute the will of Both or the will of the Triune God.

7. Does not this imply a subordination in the Two Eternal Persons?

Subordination is a thought of man, and in human language has associations which make it a dangerous term for the expression of this sublime mystery. In any case it must be used consistently with the eternal unity of essence.

8. How does the language of scripture support this doctrine?

One passage will be the key to many: St. John says of God that *He loved us, and sent His Son*, adding that *the Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.* Thus God and the Father are interchangeable terms; as here, so generally in the New Testament. Again, the same Saviour is also *God our Saviour*, in the epistle which distinguishes *God the Father and Christ Jesus our Saviour*, and speaks of *our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.* And the Holy Ghost is *the Spirit which is the Lord.*

1 John iv. 10—14.

Tit. ii. 10. Tit. i. 4. Tit. ii. 13. 2 Cor. iii. 18

§ 3. The Eternal Purpose Accomplished in Time.

1. How is the redeeming purpose carried up in scripture to eternity?

In a variety of phrases which more or less borrow the language of time.

(1) The gospel is said to be *the revelation of the mystery which hath been kept in silence through times eternal:* of which we can only say that times are, as it were, lost in eternity, but nevertheless continue their name.

Rom. xvi. 25.

(2) The counsel is said to have been bound up with the eternal gift of Christ, *purposed in Him*, Who was *the Beloved* in heaven and on earth: the incarnate Son was *the mystery of God*, not indeed here of His essence but of His will for man.

Eph. i. 10. Col. ii. 2.

(3) This purpose is presented as foreknowledge: the Redeemer *was foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world.* St. Peter here outruns the other disciple, who speaks only of *the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world.* Their combination is of great importance.

1 Peter i. 20. Rev. xiii. 8.

2. What is the bearing of all these testimonies?

That the redeeming purpose was or is outside of the

manifestation of man and his sin, and enfolds the whole: a truth of unspeakable importance to theology and human hope.

3. What is the specific value of St. John's last testimony above?

It shows the point where eternity joins time: the eternal purpose was actual at the beginning of human history; and the fulness of time was virtually come in Paradise itself.

Gal. iv. 4. **4. But what is the scriptural Fulness of the Time?**

The period when the purpose of redemption was accomplished in the incarnation of the Son of God: this being viewed (1) as a period fixed in the counsel itself; and (2) as a period when the world itself was ripe for it.

5. How is the purpose viewed as it respects the former?

As the end of a series of preparatory covenant dispensations, given in progressive disclosures: this was the Divine positive preparation by a chosen people.

6. And how as it respects the latter?

As the end of a long trial of the endeavour of mankind: this was the negative preparation in the Gentile world, which *through its wisdom knew not God.*

1 Cor. i. 21.

7. What were the characteristics of the Divine preparation?

Progressive foreannouncement in prophecy and type, generally; and, particularly, a series of covenants or dispensations having express reference to the coming Saviour.

8. Define prophecy and type in their relations.

Prophecy is the prediction of the coming of the Redeemer in word; type is the prediction in act. The types and prophecies of Christ go on together through the Old Testament. They begin human history: Adam was the first *Type* or *figure of Him that was to come;* and the first prophecy was: *It*—her Seed—*shall bruise thy head.*

Rom. v. 14.
Gen. iii. 15.

Isaac was a type, and the prophecy was: *In thy Seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.* Solomon was a type, and the prophecy was: *I will set up thy Seed after thee, . . . and I will establish the throne of His kingdom for ever.* This threefold reference to the One Seed—of the woman, of Abraham, and of David—illustrates a law. Gen. xxii. 18. 2 Sam. vii. 13.

9. What is the connection between the general fore-announcement and the specific dispensations?

The promises concerning the coming Christ were given and preserved in successive revelations limited to a chosen people *at sundry times* or *in divers portions;* and the measures according to which these were meted out or dispensed by God are expressed by the word dispensations. Heb. i. 1.

10. Does the scriptural word for dispensation note this?

Not precisely: there is one word, *οἰκονομία*, which is translated both by dispensation and economy. This latter signifies rather the ordering of God's house or church as in the form of economies: for instance, under the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Christian dispensations.

11. But does not economy connote stewardship?

Yes: and in that sense the New Testament speaks of only two economies: the Israelites *were intrusted with the oracles of God*, and *Moses indeed was faithful in all his house;* in the Christian economy *Christ as a Son* is *over God's house*, and the apostles under Him had *the dispensation of the fulness of the times* committed to them. Rom. iii. 2. Heb. iii. 5, 6. Eph. i. 10.

12. What is the relation to this of the word covenant?

(1) The general meaning of the word *διαθήκη*, covenant, is a Divine institution for man: it is not *συνθήκη* or compact between two parties. God has the ordering of all, and therefore covenant and dispensation are really the same.

(2) But the peculiarity of covenant is that it is always ratified by sacrifice, and imposes conditions to be complied with in order to the enjoyment of privileges.

13. How many covenants are spoken of?

One only, but divided into three branches.

14. What was the one covenant?

The covenant of grace appointed for the human race in Christ: Who is called the *covenant of the people*, its mediator, its promise, and its administrator from the beginning.

Isa. xlix. 8.

15. How was this divided into three branches?

God entered into covenants with mankind before the law; with the peculiar people under the law; and with all the world again, after that narrower covenant, in Christ.

16. What was its peculiarity before the law?

(1) That it was repeatedly renewed with individuals as representing the world: Adam, Noah, Abraham. (2) That the covenant was ratified with Abraham as at once representing the world and the chosen race of his descendants. Thus as the last of the universal covenants and the first of the limited, it is introduced with deep solemnity in the great covenant chapter.

Gen. xv. 18.

17. What peculiarity had the covenant under the law?

It was national; had circumcision and the passover as its signs and seals; engaged the people to a service of ceremonial rites and many political obligations; made obedience to the law as outward ordinance its condition; and thus kept alive a sense of the condemnation of sin, with the hope of a Redeemer.

18. Where was it established and how?

After the people had left Egypt; and *by the hand of a mediator*, Moses.

Gal. iii. 19.

19. Was there but one covenant under the law?

(1) Only one, called in the New Testament *the first* and *the old*. (2) But under it there were certain subordinate covenants entered into with types of the Messiah and foreshadowing His offices: for instance, Aaron, Samuel, and David.

Heb. ix. 1; viii. 13.

20. What is its character under the gospel?

(1) It is *new* and *better* and unchangeable or *everlasting*: this last Old-Testament word being paraphrased in the New.

Heb. viii. 8, 6. Isa. lv. 3.

(2) It is *established* or *enacted* upon *better promises:* promises that is of the filial inheritance. Heb. viii. 6.

(3) Hence it is elevated into a *testament:* the promises become ours through *the death of the Testator.* Heb. ix. 16.

(4) That death is the ratification of all the covenants in one for ever: *the new testament* (or *covenant*) *in My blood.* 1 Cor. xi. 25.

(5) It is universal: that is, its provisions are offered to all, and every man may *set his seal to this, that God is true.* John iii. 33.

(6) It is particular also: He who is *the one mediator* (μεσίτης) between God and men, as *a ransom for all*, is the *surety* (ἔγγυος) as between God and believers. But this must be reserved. 1 Tim. ii. 6. Heb. vii. 22.

21. By what terms is the accomplishment of the eternal purpose described?

(1) As the *economy* or *dispensation of the fulness of times:* when all former dispensations were perfected. Eph. i. 10. Rom. xvi. 25.

(2) As *the revelation of the mystery through times eternal kept in silence:* all the secrets of heaven being disclosed. This sublime view is common to our Lord and St. Paul: the psalmist having given the note. Matt. xiii. 11, 35. Ps. lxxviii. 2. Heb. ix. 26.

(3) As the *end* or *consummation of the ages*, or *the fulness of the time*, or the *last days.* Gal. iv. 4. Acts ii. 17.

22. What is the emphasis on the last days?

In nearly the same phrase we have three characteristics of the perfect economy described. (1) The final revelation of the Divine will *in His Son.* (2) The finished atonement in His *precious blood*, Who was manifested *at the end of the times.* (3) The bestowment of the *Spirit upon all flesh.* Heb. i. 2. 1 Pet. i. 20. Acts ii. 17.

23. In what sense may the purpose be said to have been accomplished?

As the fulfilment of the decree of objective salvation: according to this last threefold answer.

§ 4. Historical.

1. What controversies have arisen on this general subject?

Many on subordinate points; but one preeminently that is limited to it: that concerning the predestinating decrees.

2. Is the germ of this controversy in scripture?

Only in the epistle to the Romans does it appear as matter of discussion; but neither there nor anywhere is the election or hardening carried up to eternity. The ways of God with Jew or Gentile in time are the subject; and we are warned off from controversy as to *His ways past tracing out.*

Rom. xi. 33.

3. What course has it taken in Christian times?

The initiative was taken by Augustine, who introduced into the patristic church the predestination of individuals to special, irresistible grace. In the ninth century, Gottschalk first formulated the predestination to death; but this GEMINA PRÆDESTINATIO was ambiguous until the eve of the Reformation, the absolute predestination to sin and the limitation of the atonement never having been issued as dogmas. The mediæval theology and the council of Trent favoured universal redemption. So did the Lutheran formularies. But Calvin carried out to its issue what Augustine began: basing the limitation of grace solely on the absolute sovereignty of God.

4. Has this stern type been maintained?

Only by few in the highest form of SUPRALAPSARIANISM: that is, of a decree in eternity including a necessary fall.

5. What reactions have set in?

Among Calvinists themselves some have preferred to make the determining decree date this side the fall: INFRALAPSARIANS. Under this latter head may be classed those modifications which in France and England have limited the decree to the elect and made it hypothetical. In another sense, the advocates of universal redemption are Infralapsarians, since all admit that, the fall and redemption being presupposed, there is a predestination of the saints to life and of all who are foreseen as reprobate to death.

6. What is the issue of this controversy?

We are not permitted to speak or think of eternal decrees: to us the Divine purposes are expressed in terms of time and are conditional.

Chapter II.

The Person of Christ.

§ 1. The Person and Personality.

1. What is the theological meaning of this term?

It expresses the truth that in the undivided and indivisible unity of two natures our Lord is one person for ever.

2. What does this definition guard against?

(1) The error of ascribing to Christ two personalities: as if He was the personal Son of God joined to a personal son of man. (2) Also the error of regarding the Divine and human natures as so blended that the Redeemer is one person in one composite nature.

3. Are these distinctions logically conceivable?

Most certainly they are, though they pass understanding. Their value is not their explanation of the mystery; but their protection of the doctrine.

4. Is their importance so fundamental?

This truth lies at the basis of Christianity as it reveals a Mediator and mediation. One represents man to God and God to man Who is as a person distinct from both: His person is not His Divinity alone, nor is it His humanity alone, but the Being who calls these two natures alike His own.

5. But would not two persons, Divine and human, united answer every purpose of mediation?

A mediator must be one personal agent.

6. Give the more precise theological statement of this.

The Person of Christ is both Divine and human. As

Divine He represents God to man ; as human He represents mankind to God. The personality, or supreme I of the person, is Divine ; and gives the virtue of Divinity to all that belongs to His mediation and work.

7. Does not this introduce a strange distinction between person and personality ?

It simply declares that the Divine person took human nature ; and continued still to be the supreme agent after the incarnation as He was before.

8. Has not the human nature a personality of its own ?

Not in this case. The Lord's human nature possessed a will, but will as such is not essential personality. Personality means a self-conscious agent ; and that in Christ was always the Son of God.

9. But can we speak of impersonal human nature ?

We need not use the phrase. But what the phrase signifies is the glory of Christianity, and the very secret of the atonement. Our Lord represented not a man but men ; He took our nature, or conditions of life, before personality belonged to it ; and He enriched His human estate with a Divine personality which perfectly controlled the human will.

10. How then may we trace the scriptural teaching ?

By showing that there is one personality ; always that of the Eternal Son ; nevertheless, always as animating a perfect human nature.

§ 2. The Undivided Person and Personality.

1. How is the unity of our Lord's person exhibited ?

In two ways : (1) Sometimes that one and the same person is described formally as possessing two natures. (2) There is always one personal subject, or personality, to Whom belong interchangeably both Divine and human attributes.

2. Give instances of the former.

In sundry passages our Lord's human nature is called His

flesh, and His Divine nature is expressly set over against it. He was *of the seed of David according to the flesh,* Rom. i. 3, 4. *Who was declared to be the Son of God with power,* Rom. ix. 5. *according to the Spirit of holiness.* Again: *Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, Who is over all, God blessed for ever.* The ONLY antithesis of flesh and spirit in Christ is that of His two natures. *The Word became flesh and dwelt among us,* or *is come in the flesh,* or *in the likeness of sinful flesh.* John i. 14. 1 John iv. 2. Rom. viii. 3.

3. Is this antithesis really without exception?

It is hard to dispute it. One passage might seem to speak of the Lord's flesh as the flesh of mere infirmity: *Who in the days of His flesh having offered up . . . !* But, Heb. v. 7, 8. as earlier in the epistle the incarnation was seen to Heb. ii. 14. be His partaking with the *sharers in flesh and blood,* so here *Though He was a Son* follows. The Flesh is the one formula for His human nature; and the Divine corresponds in a variety of terms: the Word, the Son, the Spirit of holiness, 1 Tim. iii 16. or the Spirit, or the Eternal Spirit, God over all, are 1 Pet. iii. 19. Heb. ix. 14. set over against it.

4. Can "Spirit of holiness" and "God over all" be applied to the Divine nature of Christ?

Spirit is the common name of God, and belongs to each of the Three Persons. And our Lord is mediatorially the God Who is OVER ALL. These and other such passages are difficult on any scheme of interpretation; but the theory of antithesis between the two natures offers them the simplest solution.

5. Give instances of the second law mentioned above.

(1) The one eternal I or ME reigns throughout the Gospels; a Subject with attributes taken from heaven and earth, eternity and time, Divinity and humanity. *Hast thou seen Abraham? Before Abraham was, I am! Glorify Thou Me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.* John viii. 57, 58. John xvii. 5.

(2) This one subject, the Person of Christ, has many names; and is referred to in many ways throughout the New Testament: God, the Son, the Son of man Jesus, Jesus Christ,

the Lord, the Saviour, and some others. But the predicates are taken from both natures, or from either: for instance, *The Son of man, Which is in heaven; The church of God, which He purchased with His own blood; They would not have crucified the Lord of glory.*

John iii. 13. Acts xx. 28 1 Cor. ii. 8.

6. State more particularly the force of these testimonies.

They lead up by induction to the great law that to One Person belong two natures equally, indissolubly, and without confusion. This is the key of the New-Testament phraseology.

7. What theological term expresses this combination?

The Hypostatic Union.

8. What is meant by this?

The union refers to the two natures: Hypostasis here means person; and signifies that the union is not that of fusion, but results in a personal unity.

9. What four terms protect this entire doctrine?

Christ is TRULY God, PERFECTLY man, INDISSOLUBLY one person, UNCONFUSEDLY two natures. The last two are expressed by the hypostatic union; the first two have still to be more particularly seen.

§ 3. The Divine Personality of the Eternal Son.

1. What is the general meaning of this section?

That the Second Person of the Godhead, the Eternal Son, continues His personality sole and supreme in all the facts and issues of the incarnation.

2. Then the term person as applied to the Son in the Godhead has a different meaning from that which it bears in the incarnate Christ?

Yes: it may be well to remember that in the Godhead there are three Persons in one nature; while in the Christ there is one Person in two natures.

3. But is the Redeemer's Divinity always that of the Eternal Son?

Not precisely always: He is the *Word*, and He is *God*, and He is *the Lord*, in His incarnation. But generally and as the rule He is THE SON. John i. 14. Heb. i. 8. Jas. ii. 1.

4. How and by what ways is the term Son qualified?

In four ways: He is the Only-begotten Son, the Son of God, the Son absolutely, and the Son of man.

5. Are these all connected with the incarnation?

All of them, directly or indirectly; but the first three expressly assert or imply an eternal sonship before and behind the incarnation.

6. What is the precise relation of the eternal sonship to the incarnation?

It may be looked at under two aspects:

(1) As to the Holy Trinity: only the Son, in the unfathomable mystery of the Godhead, could be and was sent; not the Father nor the Holy Ghost.

(2) This shows, as to man himself, that between the Son, the eternal Image of God, and man, the human image of that Image, there is some mysterious and blessed bond.

7. Does the scripture encourage speculation on such a subject?

It perpetually suggests thoughts like these: especially, as we shall hereafter see, when the humiliation of the Son is in question and the dignity of our saved race.

§ 4. The Perfect Manhood.

1. What does this involve as to the Person of Christ?

That the Divine personality of the Eternal Son appeared in a perfect human nature: in it living and acting and suffering as *Immanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us.* Matt. i. 23.

2. What is the force of the adjective Perfect?

Twofold: (1) the manhood He assumed was, without diminution, body, soul, and spirit; (2) it was without addition: the Divine Logos ruled in that nature, but as distinct and not blended with it.

3. Why is the emphasis on His assuming human nature?

To mark that He did not join Himself to a man, conceived with the germ of an independent personal existence; but that He was the Son of God living, amidst human conditions, in that human nature which was the ideal in the mind of the Creator when man was first created.

4. Is not this notion of a human nature apart from a distinct human personality an unreality?

In human philosophy it may be; but not in the Divine philosophy of scripture, which assumes this without explaining it. Our Lord was the Son incarnate; not a man united to God in any manner however preeminent.

5. May we not include in the perfection of this nature its sinlessness?

Not precisely so. The human nature is perfect only in its constituents: a spirit acting through the body as a soul. From sin our Lord's manhood was specially shielded.

6. In what way specially shielded?

His human nature was conceived of the virgin by the Holy Ghost, and thus saved from the taint of original sin as well as its condemnation. He could not sin after that because He was the Son of God. In other words, He was sinless through His Divine conception; and He was impeccable, or for ever incapable of sin, because His only personality was never other than that of the Eternal Son.

7. How does the New Testament explain and protect this?

(1) By the terms of incarnation. Our Lord is *Man,*
1 Tim. ii. 5. *Christ Jesus; The Word became flesh;* He *partook*
John i. 14. Heb. ii. 14. *of the same flesh and blood* which the children shared;

but was sent only *in the likeness of sinful flesh;* the final testimony being that Jesus Christ *is come in the flesh.* Rom. viii. 3. 1 John iv. 2.

(2) By representing the Son of God as having and developing and using every element of human nature throughout His career. Before the resurrection Jesus *increased in wisdom*, and He *perceived in His spirit*, cried *My soul is exceeding sorrowful*, and *Not as I will, but as Thou wilt.* After the resurrection He said, *A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have*, thus asserting the verity of the lower part of His humanity, which then most needed assertion and evidence. Luke ii. 52. Mark ii. 8. Matt. xxvi. 38, 39. Luke xxiv. 39.

§ 5. Historical.

1. What have been the bearings of controversy on this subject?

Vital differences have existed as to the Two Natures respectively, and then as to the nature of their Union.

2. Excluding errors as to the Divinity of Christ?

Those who hold this error have no doctrine of the PERSON of the Incarnate Redeemer, as we understand it.

3. Which were the earliest heresies ■■ to the verity of both natures at once?

Those of the Gnostics, who regarded the Divinity as an emanation or æon, and the humanity as only a seeming appearance in the flesh: hence Docetæ (from δοκεῖν, to seem).

4. Which heresies dishonoured the two natures respectively?

(1) The Apollinarians assailed the human nature by denying that the Lord had a human spirit, making His Divinity take its place or render it superfluous.

(2) The Arians denied the eternal consubstantiality of the Son and the Father: they regarded the Son as God generated of His essence by the Divine will before the world was. The semi-Arians endeavoured to explain and reconcile by changing ὁμοούσιον, of the SAME substance, into ὁμοιούσιον, of LIKE substance. But there can be no such thing as inferior Divinity.

5. What were the leading errors as to the union of the Two Natures?

Two: Nestorianism and Eutychianism. Nestorius and Eutyches gave these their names; but they represented two lines of error which have never been altogether absent.

6. Where lies the theological danger of Nestorianism?

It represented Christ as having two persons in two natures: dividing the Person. And its danger is that of making the One Saviour two separate agents, thus taking away from the work of the Redeemer its supreme Divinity.

7. And what is the peril of Eutychianism?

It represented Christ as having one person in one nature: confounding the Natures. And its danger is that of removing from redemption the pure humanity of the Redeemer, and giving Him a nature neither perfect God nor perfect man.

8. When were these errors severally condemned?

(1) At the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325), the Divinity of the Son, consubstantial with the Father, was established.

(2) At that of Constantinople (A.D. 381) the reality of the human spirit of Christ was asserted: as also the Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

(3) At that of Ephesus (A.D. 431) the unity of our Lord's Person was vindicated.

(4) And at that of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) the verity of His two natures: a general formulary of the true doctrine being issued, which is still the last word on the subject.

9. What quaternion of terms protect the truth?

Our Lord was affirmed to be TRULY God in the first; PERFECTLY Man in the second; UNDIVIDEDLY one Person in the third; and UNCONFUSEDLY Two Natures in the fourth.

10. Were there not other errors on this subject?

Not strictly as to the Person of Christ. Later errors on the relation of the union of the two natures to our Lord's humiliation will appear in due course.

CHAPTER III.

The Historical Christ, or the Process of the Mediatorial Work.

1. What range of subjects do we now enter on?

The ministry of our Lord as historically accomplished, including His incarnation as the basis of all; His two estates as humbled and exalted; the relations of His three offices.

2. Is this what is meant by "the Life of Jesus?"

The life of our Lord, as a manifestation of the Son of God, cannot be written: or only as an exposition of the Gospels.

I.

The Incarnation of the Son of God.

1. Why is the incarnation here alone and as apart?

Because it is the basis of our Lord's estates and offices: preceding and underlying and outlasting them all.

2. Is not the incarnation, or the descent to our nature, the beginning of His humbled estate?

Strictly it is not: He *emptied Himself*, as the pre-temporal Son, by a previous CONDESCENSION, of the *form of God.* Phil. ii. 6, 7.

3. Does then the incarnation in any intelligible sense precede the manifestation in the flesh?

To this there are two answers. (1) The purpose was virtually accomplished; and in this sense we speak of the incarnation as a Divine reality before time was: the last Adam is as real in paradise as the first. (2) Though we have no word in scripture to express the idea, we must regard the assumption of human nature as a theological conception distinct from the actual birth of the virgin.

4. How does scriptural phraseology comport with this?

(1) Our Lord never speaks but of His coming from heaven:
John viii. 23, 42. *I am from above. I came forth and am come from God.*

John i. 14. 1 John iv. 2. 1 Tim. iii. 5. (2) His apostles say: *The Word became flesh;* He is *come in the flesh:* He is *Jesus Christ, Himself Man.*

(3) They make the actual incarnation a necessary condi-
John i. 14. 2 Cor. v. 21. tion of the atonement: the Redeemer *became* or *was made flesh* that He might be *made to be sin* for us.

(4) Therefore the incarnation was virtually but not actually the salvation of men.

II.

The Two Estates.

1. What is signified by this phrase?

The ministry of our Lord, first as humbled on earth and then as exalted in heaven.

2. Can the limits separating these be precisely defined?

If we understand the term humiliation literally they can. Formally, His conception began and His ascension ended the
John xiii. 31; xvii. 1. Col. ii. 15. humbled estate. Really the humiliation ended with the moment of His death, which was His victory and glorification.

3. Is the history of the Mediator confined within these limits?

As He is the Mediator it is. But in a wider sense His history runs through five stages: His eternal preexistence as the Son; His unrevealed headship of the human race; His temporal manifestation; His mediatorial reign in glory; His resignation of the kingdom at the end.

I. The Estate of Humiliation.

1. Of Whose humiliation do we speak?

Of the Christ's in His incarnate Person, God and man: not of His Divinity alone, nor of His manhood alone.

2. What is the bearing of this distinction?

His union with our nature involved an obscuration or veiling of His Divinity; and the ministry He undertook involved the deep humiliation of His human nature.

3. May we make a difference between the humiliation of His Person and that of His work?

Such a distinction may be made; but it is the glory of our redemption that the two are really one, and quality each the other. The God and the Man are never separated. Col. ii. 9.

4. How are they one?

Throughout the ministry of redemption the Incarnate Son performs in successive stages one great act of vicarious OBEDIENCE. That is the one word which expresses His humiliation: *He humbled Himself* after *being made in the likeness of man.* The Divine Agent was in all the work. Phil. ii. 7, 8

5. How do they qualify each other?

The weakness of His suffering flesh, being His own, made the humiliation of the Divine Person real; but the unchangeableness of His Divine nature protected His Person from the possibility of any subjection to sin: His obedience was humiliation, only as He was the Representative of sinners.

6. What principle must guide us here?

While we distinguish between the Person and the work of the Redeemer, we must bear in mind in every statement that He is the Representative, though ONLY the Representative, of the sinning race. His humanity was the sphere of His submission.

§ 1. The Personal Humiliation Historically Viewed.

1. Where must we place the beginning of this?

In the sacred history of the Conception: the Eternal Son humbled Himself and *became flesh* in the womb of the virgin, being conceived by the direct operation of the Holy Ghost. He took or received the human nature. John i. 14. Heb. ii. 14.

2. How do we continue it?

In the pure development of the human nature of our Lord: physical, moral, intellectual, spiritual. This sinless development was that of the Incarnate Son. Its humiliation was His being, though the Son, led of the Spirit as Man.

Matt. iv. 1.

3. Did not His circumcision and baptism and temptation imply that His humiliation was a fellowship with our sinful nature?

No. All were undergone by our Lord as the sinless Representative of sinners: circumcision as He became under the JEWISH law; baptism as the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the WORLD; and His temptation to prove that as God He could not be tempted of evil as men are enticed.

Gal. iv. 4. John i. 29. Jas. i. 13.

4. Does not such a view make the temptation an unreality?

The Lord's temptation was a real test applied, as real as that applied to Adam. But it was proved that the Son of God was the strength of His human nature. During the forty days He was tried as no man ever was tried by temptations proper to the Christ. Afterwards three kinds of temptation *common to man* assailed Him, and His Divine-human answers both explain the temptations and teach us how to resist them. These answers are the key to the whole.

1 Cor. x. 13.

5. What marks of humiliation are seen in the successive stages of the Lord's life?

He encountered the lot of a righteous man in an ungodly world. These sufferings were His glory: that He endured them as the Representative of sinners who should humble themselves under the mighty hand of God was His humiliation.

6. In what sense was death the end of His humiliation?

(1) Generally, all the redeeming life was suffering *unto death*. He was *obedient even unto death*. Hence, though all was passion, the end we call THE PASSION preeminently.

Phil. ii, 8. Acts i. 3.

(2) The kind of death was the most shameful by which man can leave the world: *the death of the cross*.

Phil. ii. 8.

This connected His death with the world ; as the altar with Judaism. It is not an altar, but a cross. The sacrifice on the altar makes emphatic the good pleasure of God : the cross makes emphatic the shame of sin which He endured when He went *without the gate*, thus *bearing His reproach* and leaving the temple behind. His people *go forth unto Him*, bearing it also. Heb. xiii. 12, 13.

§ 2. The Redeeming Humiliation.

1. How is the humble estate here viewed?

As obedience ; perfect, unbroken, to the end.

2. Can there be humiliation in such obedience?

Yes, as rendered by the Son of God, the Representative of sinners. Otherwise, there is no humiliation in obedience as such.

3. How is this set forth in the scriptures?

In three cardinal and most important passages.

(1) The all-holy, incarnate Jesus, *though He was a Son, yet learned obedience :* not learned to obey, but experienced or proved all that the Messianic work imposed on Him. Heb. v. 8.

(2) All His obedience was suffering as the desert of sin ; but all His suffering was obedience. Thus it was a cancelling of human sin : the opposite of the great transgression. *As through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the One shall the many be made righteous.* He at once suffered for sin and kept the law. Rom. v. 19.

(3) *Becoming obedient even unto death.* There it ended · but not before. Death finished the lesson which the Incarnate had to learn in order to negative Adam's disobedience. Phil. ii. 8.

4. Does then the word obedience cover the whole meaning of the Saviour's work?

It does so, if obedience is made to include the whole will of God for our salvation as laid upon our Representative.

II. The Estate of Exaltation.

1. What are the stages and processes of this?

Beginning with the descent into Hades, the resurrection,

the ascension and session, it continues in the heavenly dominion, and is perfected at the end of the mediatorship.

2. What is the relation between the humbled and the exalted estates?

As the humiliation was viewed in respect of the Person and the work of Christ, so must the exaltation be at all points.

3. How does this bear on the descent?

This was the first glorification of the Redeemer's Person: He who was *manifested in the flesh* was, as God, *justified in the Spirit.* And it was the first triumph of His redeeming work: He proved Himself *Lord of the dead* as the result of His death.

1 Tim. iii. 16. Rom. xiv. 9.

4. And how on the resurrection?

(1) In it He was *declared to be the Son of God with power:* and (2) His atoning work was declared to be accepted and valid for us: *I will give you the sure mercies of David.* He *was raised for our justification.*

Rom. i. 4. Acts. xiii. 34. Rom. iv. 25.

5. What is the preeminence of the resurrection?

(1) That it sums up in itself the whole of the Lord's glorification: as the atoning death is one pillar of the faith, the resurrection is the other.

Acts. ii. 32.

(2) It is the Divine demonstration of the truth of the Christian revelation. Without it *your faith is vain.*

1 Cor. xv. 17.

(3) Hence its evidences are absolute. The only *infallible proofs* given in scripture are related to this. And to sincere examination they are infallible through the Holy Ghost.

Acts i. 3. Acts v. 32.

6. What is the relation of the ascension and session?

(1) The ascension was the sequel of the resurrection, as it regards the Lord's Person; and therefore the close of His earthly manifestation.

(2) The session was the ascension, viewed rather with relation to heaven than to earth. The Lord ascended from earth, being *parted from* His disciples, and *sate down on the right hand of the Majesty on high*

Luke xxiv. 51. Heb. i. 3.

7. What is His dignity in heaven?

(1) That all principalities and powers are *put in subjection under His feet.* Eph. i. 22.

(2) That He is accomplishing all the designs of the Holy Trinity: *Head over all things to the church.* Eph. i. 22.

8. How are we to understand its final surrender?

As to the Redeemer's work this will belong to His exaltation: since it will declare every other authority *subjected unto Him.* As to His Person, He will as Mediator cease to be between the Trinity and the creature: *that God may be all in all.* ‖ Cor. xv. 28.

III.

The Three Offices: The Christ as Prophet, Priest and King.

1. In what sense is the term Offices appropriate?

As redemption is the ministry of the Incarnate Son, called in His humiliation the SERVANT of God, this term has its fitness. But scripture never uses anything equivalent to it; and we should apply the expression with great care. Isa. lii. 13. Acts iii. 26.

2. What relation is there between the offices and the Christ?

Christ from the Greek and Messiah from the Hebrew signify anointed. In the Old Testament the prophets, priests, and kings who typified the future Redeemer were consecrated to the service of God, and fitted for it by the Holy Spirit using the emblem of an effusion of *holy anointing oil.* No longer using the emblem that Spirit descended upon Jesus, consecrated His Person and filled His human spirit with the preparation for His work of redemption. He thus became THE ANOINTED ONE preeminently, THE LORD'S CHRIST. Ex. xxx. 22–33. Luke ii. 26.

3. What is the history of this name in scripture?

It was used thrice in the ancient prophecy; it became in the New Testament the elect name of the Redeemer as such; it has given a name to His religion; and it marks the sanctity of those who are one with Him by receiving His unction. Psalm ii. 2; xlv. 7. Isa. xli. 1. Dan. ix. 24. ‖ John ii. 27.

4. How does the New Testament exhibit the consecration of Jesus as Christ?

As the preparation of His human nature at the conception; and as His being sealed to the Messianic office at His baptism. The first was the basis of the second.

Luke ii. 26. John i. 31.

5. And how the assumption of the several offices?

Though our Lord was from His baptism the perfect Christ, we mark that in Nazareth He formally entered on the prophetic office; that in His consecration prayer He assumed the highpriesthood; and after the resurrection, on the mountain in Galilee, announced His assumption of all power as given to Him in consequence of His death.

Luke iv. 21. John xvii. 19. Matt. xxviii. 18.

6. And how His subsequent exercise of it?

He is still in heaven the one Christ in the three offices: all of which as Christ He will lay down at the last day.

I. The Christ as Prophet.

1. In what sense do we use this word?

In its widest, most absolute, and incommunicable meaning as the Revealer of all knowledge to man. But also more specifically as the Great Teacher of the Christian revelation: the Light of men, and the Founder of Christianity.

2. In the latter sense how may it be unfolded?

Our Lord was a minister to His own generation for three years; and Himself the Truth for all time.

3. How to His own generation?

He was the Prophet of whom Moses said to his people that God would raise Him up *from among your brethren, as He raised up me.* Hence throughout His teaching He is an expositor of the Old Testament, and a prophet of things to come: *a Minister of the circumcision.*

Acts vii. 37. Rom. xv. 8.

4. And how for all time?

As the supreme Lawgiver, and as the Preacher of His own

gospel. These subjects, therefore, may be referred to a later stage, when Vocation and Ethics are before us.

II. The Christ as Priest.

1. What does this term cover?

The whole work of the Redeemer as offering the atoning sacrifice: both on earth and in heaven.

2. How is it presented in the New Testament?

As the fulfilment of the entire sacrificial service of the ancient temple, and of the Old Testament generally.

3. What is the relation between type and antitype here?

This is matter of great importance. There are two opposite and contradictory views.

(1) It is said that the redeeming work of Christ is only described in terms derived from the old economy and accommodated to it. This is an utterly false view of type and antitype, in relation to the coming Redeemer.

(2) The truth is that the ancient system was constructed with reference to the future atonement, which was the true pattern shown on the mount. The sacrificial ideas are not figures in the New Testament: they are figures only in the Old. Heb. viii. 5.

4. In what sense was Christ anointed as priest?

As the antitype of the high priest, who represented in his relation to Christ the whole economy of priesthood and sacrifice and temple.

§ 1. The High Priest.

1. Is there difference here between priest and high priest?

Both terms are used of our Lord. (1) They are one in the supreme idea, that of representing man to God and God to man; (2) they differ in that the priest was occupied in the sacrifice without, the high priest had his supreme function in entering before God; (3) but Christ was a priest on earth, though He *sprang out of Judah*, and is high priest in heaven. Heb. vii. 14.

2. Was the high priest at all points a type of Christ?

Yes: both where he was unlike and where he was like Him. As to the former: Aaron and his successors were *taken from among men*, Christ was *Separate from sinners;* they offered for their *own sins*, He only for *the sins of the people;* they were *many*, He had *an unchangeable priesthood.*

Heb. v. 1. Heb. vii. 26. Heb. vii. 27. Heb. vii. 23, 24.

3. How otherwise is the supremacy of Christ's office marked?

By this, that He alone has really executed the office of a high priest, in bringing man to God and God to man: the repeated emphasis is on His entering heaven once for all by the one sacrifice of His own blood; whereas the repetition of the Levitical sacrifices, and the remaining of the veil before the holiest, showed that they did not effect the true mediation.

Heb. ix. 12.

4. Did not then the ancient service avail for any end?

(1) It was the service of a *worldly sanctuary:* as to the earthly relation of the people to their God it was thoroughly effectual. But (2) only of a worldly sanctuary: as to true fellowship with God in the heavenly sanctuary it was only *a shadow of good things to come.* (3) Yet the virtue of Christ's mediation surrounded and penetrated the whole to faith, and in things pertaining to the conscience.

Heb. ix. 1. Heb. x. 1.

5. What other tokens are given of this last point?

In the epistle to the Hebrews, which gives an evangelical account of the ancient sanctuary, are three other remarkable proofs: Melchizedek, the Oath, and the One Faith.

(1) It is said that there was a priestly type of Christ higher than Aaron: Melchizedek, namely, who was *made like unto the Son of God*, and represented the divinity, unity, and abidingness of the universal priesthood, which the Levitical foreshadowed in one land and for a limited period. Melchizedek represented the spiritual priesthood of Christ.

Heb. vii. 3.

(2) The highpriesthood of our Lord is solemnly declared to have been established on the oath of God, rather than upon the Levitical law of priesthood: the

Heb. vii. 20.

OATH that confirms the PROMISE given again and again from the beginning, outside of Judaism and surrounding it; as it were the gospel before the law.

(3) It is shown that faith in a great unseen sacrifice availed from the days of Abel downward, and will avail as faith in the sacrifice manifested to the end of time. Heb xi.

§ 2. The Sacrifices.

1. In what relation do these stand to the priesthood of Christ?

Everything in connection with them—their rites, their kinds, their times—furnishes illustration of the atonement, and should be therefore carefully studied.

2. Illustrate this by the rites of sacrifice.

(1) The presentation and examination of the victim, with the laying on of the offerer's hands, pointed to the Saviour, Himself Priest and Victim, who represented the offerer too: He *offered Himself without spot to God.* Heb. ix. 14.

(2) Also the slaughtering, and sprinkling of the blood. *It is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul;* because *the life of the flesh is in the blood.* The blood of atonement was sprinkled on the altar and towards the veil. It covered or cancelled the sin or guilt, as expiation; and thus brought God near, as propitiation: both are in the one word. Lev. xvii. 11. Lev. xxi. 6.

(3) And the burning by sacrificial fire with eating of part: that is, God receiving by fire and man as food. Both signify acceptance and reconciliation; and have their final fulfilment in the Lord's supper. 1 Cor. x. 17.

3. Did all these rites pertain to every sacrifice?

Not as complete in any one. But all unite in the Lord's offering.

(1) The burnt offering was the earliest and supreme typical sacrifice: including all but the eating. God alone received it by fire: He once for all received the total oblation of Jesus, and still receives ours for the sake of His. Gen. viii. 20, 21. Eph. v. 2.

(2) The various peace offerings were based upon the former: personal gratitude and dedication of gifts were expressed in these. *He is our peace.* Lev. vii. 11. Eph. ii. 14.

(3) The sin offering, introduced under the law, was the special type of Christ's sacrifice Who *was made sin for us.*

2 Cor. v. 21.

§ 3. The Seasons of Sacrifice.

1. What seasons of sacrifice were specially typical of the Christian atonement?

(1) The passover, with its sequel the pentecost, or feast of weeks; in the spring.

Ex. xii.

(2) The day of atonement, in the autumn; when the high priest presented the blood of the sin offering within the veil for the transgressions of the whole people.

Lev. xvi.

2. How were these related to each other?

(1) The passover commemorated the redemption of the Israelites from bondage, and the institution of Jehovah's covenant with them by sacrifice. It was the feast of the families of Israel as such. The Lord's supper is the Christian passover—*Christ our passover is sacrificed for us; wherefore let us keep the feast*—as the commemoration of His sacrifice.

1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

(2) The day of atonement was the great national fast.

3. How were they related to the other seasons of sacrifice?

The passover was the first of three national feasts: being followed by the feast of weeks and the feast of tabernacles. The day of atonement summed up once in the year the daily sin offerings, and the sin and trespass offerings of individuals.

4. How were they related to the Christian sacrifice?

They foreshadowed the one atonement, as the expiation of sin and the redemption of man. In the cross they and all sacrifices with all their rites found their end.

III. The Christ as King.

1. How is this office presented to us in scripture?

As the mediatorial authority of Christ in His one person, Divine and human; based however on His death, which obtained for Him the lordship over the race and the universe, for the accomplishment of the Divine eternal purpose; and exercised until the last day from His place at God's right hand in heaven.

Rom. xiv. 9.

2. What is its relation to His other offices?

It must be remembered that the offices are not distinguished in scripture as we distinguish them.

(1) The prophetic and kingly office are really one: *Hear ye Him!* unites them for ever. Matt. xvii. 5.

(2) Melchizedek was the type of Christ as priest and king. When the Antitype for ever sate down the types ceased and were absorbed in His saving presence in heaven.

(3) Hence the intercession and benediction of the High Priest in heaven is part of His supremacy, and not to be distinguished from it. He blesses as the ascended Lord.

3. What is its special relation to the church?

The *Great Priest over the House of God* is Head of the church which is the kingdom of Christ. Our Lord is not called the King of His church but its Head. Heb. x. 21

4. What is its relation to theology?

(1) As the supreme authority of the Lawgiver it is found in the ethics of redemption and the doctrine of the church.

(2) As the highpriestly authority it appears in the administration of redemption by the Holy Ghost.

(3) As specially the royal authority its exercise takes us to the doctrine of final judgment.

IV.

Historical.

1. What has been the course of controversy on these subjects?

After the decisions of the four œcumenical councils as to the person of Christ, controversy was continued rather with respect to the nature of our Lord's subordination: in other words, there has been a continual effort to fathom the impenetrable mystery of the union of the two natures.

2. What were the earliest forms of speculation?

Two errors express it: the monophysite, or the doctrine of one nature in Christ, which was the Eutychian heresy

revived; and the monothelite, which was a compromise, urging that there was only one will in Christ. These were condemned in the fifth and sixth œcumenical councils, but representatives of them remain in the East to this day.

3. What form did it take at the Reformation?

(1) The Lutherans adopted the principle that after the ascension the human nature of Christ was clothed with Divine attributes: by a COMMUNICATIO IDIOMATUM, or common possession of properties between the two natures. This gave the technical term Ubiquity to the glorified humanity as the foundation of the doctrine of Consubstantiation.

(2) The Reformed rejected this; regarding the humiliation of the person of Christ as belonging for ever to both natures: the Divine sank into an obscuration or concealment only of its attributes, and the human was exalted to the perfection of humanity alone.

(3) The Tridentine council confirmed the mediæval dogma of a continued repetition of the humiliation through the transubstantiation of the eucharistic elements: by which the Divine and human are really confounded and made one.

4. What have been later developments?

It has been thought by divines, especially in Lutheranism, that the problem of theological science is to explain the unity of Christ's Person as being at once the Infinite and the finite.

5. How has this been attempted?

Whereas early Lutheranism was content with exalting the humanity into participation of Divine attributes at the ascension, more modern thought begins with the incarnation and occupies itself with theories of the kenosis or emptying of the Son, and His depotentiation or selfretraction and reduction within the finite limits of the human soul.

6. What judgment may be passed on this?

That it goes beyond the limits of inquiry sanctioned by revelation. In scripture certain principles are laid down not for the explanation but for the protection of this unfathom-

able doctrine. (1) The condescension of the Son of God was His divesting Himself of the manifestation of His attributes: His essential Divinity being immutable. (2) The humiliation was that of His Person until the end of the world. (3) The end will be like the beginning, the unhumbled condescension of the Son to abide in human nature for ever.

Phil. ii. 7. Heb. xiii. 8. 1 Cor. xv. 24. 1 Cor. xv. 28.

7. May not speculation be allowed to go farther than this?

Never with success. Christ is the *mystery of God:* not only as a secret revealed, but as a secret eternally incomprehensible. And the only language in which thought on this subject may be safely shaped is that of the scripture itself.

Col. ii. 2.

8. Meanwhile, are not the two estates and the three offices mutually protective?

They are so: for the prophetic, priestly, and regal functions of the Christ require the precise distinction of the two natures, whether as humbled or exalted; while the unity of the Person in both estates ensures the eternal fulfilment of all that the offices mean. In each the Divine underlies the human.

9. What general safeguards may be laid down with regard to the three offices?

(1) It is important to remember that in this sense also Christ is not divided: His Person and His work are alike one.

(2) That the sacrificial office of the High Priest is really fundamental, and contains the marrow and substance of the Saviour's mediatorial redemption.

(3) That most of the errors which afflict the Christian church have sprung from forgetting this. Hence by a large number the Saviour's relation to mankind is reduced to that of a teacher or lord in morals, preeminent among human authorities but only human.

(4) The observation already made cannot be too often repeated, that the mystery of our Lord's condescension to appear in the flesh is one that in our present estate at least, if not for ever, cannot with any success be inquired into.

(5) The scriptural method of setting the subject before us is that of giving our Lord a series of NAMES, which severally and unitedly furnish the best exhibition of His manifold

character. To these names, which, like the names of God, are objects of faith rather than investigation, we now turn.

V.

The Names of Jesus.

1. What is the importance of the scriptural names of our Lord?

They range over the Person, the estates and the offices of Christ; and are as it were the terms by which the Holy Ghost teaches the doctrines of the gospel. Hence the study of these names, singly and collectively, is the study of Christian theology.

2. What class of names define the Person of our Lord?

Some belong to the pretemporal Redeemer; some to His incarnate estate; and some are derived from both, or are common to the Godhead and the manhood.

3. Can any names be surely applied to the being of Christ before the incarnation?

He is called GOD; He is by comparison of passages JEHOVAH or LORD; but it is as THE SON that His pretemporal estate is most directly indicated. And when He is spoken of as the ONLY-BEGOTTEN, this goes higher than His miraculous conception: a point of profound importance.

John i. 1. Mal. iii. 1. Luke i. 76. John iii. 16.

4. What names express the incarnation?

As incarnate our Lord is once called IMMANUEL, though rather as a sign than as a name; His own designation of Himself was SON OF MAN. Theology has no specific term for the mystery of the One Person answering to that of Trinity for the mystery of the Godhead; but adopts adjectives, such as INCARNATE and DIVINE-HUMAN.

Matt. i. 23. Isa. vii. 14. Passim.

5. What names embrace the Divine and human natures?

THE SON in its general application blends the two; and it is perhaps the only one that does so.

6. What may be called the official names?

They are of two classes: those which emphasise the dignity in the humiliation, and those which emphasise the

humiliation rather than the dignity. The latter are most common.

7. Which are the former?

He is called THE LORD, THE LORD OF GLORY, as crucified; THE PRINCE OF LIFE; we may add also THE WORD; and THE FIRST-BEGOTTEN: *before every creature*, and *from the dead*. But none of these names has passed into ordinary use.

1 Cor. ii. 8. Acts iii. 15. Col. i. 15, 18.

8. Which are the latter?

JESUS THE CHRIST, THE SERVANT (or, as formerly, *Child*, παῖς) of God; and all those names which He receives from His several offices: these however being not so much names as theological designations of our Lord in relation to His work. A name not used in scripture, THE REDEEMER, has become the most usual designation in the Christian church.

Acts iii. 26. Isa. lix. 20. Rom. xi. 26.

9. What are the names of His prophetic office?

Some were transitory, belonging to His earthly ministry; such as Rabbi, Prophet, Teacher, Minister of the Circumcision, Apostle. Nor has any been permanent, unless THE WORD may be considered an abiding name.

Rom. xv. 8. Heb. iii. 1.

10. What are those which His priesthood gives Him?

They are very abundant: High Priest, Paraclete, the Lamb of God, the Propitiation, being the most prominent.

1 John ii. 1. John i. 29. 1 John iv. 10.

11. Which spring from His mediatorial kingship?

The preeminent is THE LORD, which absorbs into itself all others. This is perhaps the most universally used of all the names that His offices have given the Saviour. It answers rather to the Adonai than to the Jehovah of the Old Testament; and may be traced throughout the New Testament as the expression of the reverence of the disciples. Bearing this significance it is combined with almost every other.

12. What miscellaneous names are applied to the Lord?

The whole of scripture abounds with figurative expressions, taken from every region, to describe the character and

supreme excellence and unbounded preciousness of Christ. Our Lord Himself has used them in large number: the catalogue of figurative designations which He has given to Himself is a very large and very instructive one. These belong rather to devotional theology.

13. How are these names combined in scripture?

The combinations are very diversified, and should be studied as they occur, and where they occur, with reference to the reasons for them. It will be found that JESUS gradually became CHRIST, each word by degrees passing from an official designation to a personal name, and then JESUS CHRIST. In St. Peter's epistles we have the most lofty combinations, the second surpassing the first: OUR GOD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, JESUS OUR LORD, OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. The Apocalypse gives a variety of new figurative names, together with some which identify Him with Jehovah.

2 Pet. i. 1, 2, 11.

14. How are we to understand the infrequent application of the word God to our Saviour?

(1) On the ground of His subordination to the Father in the work of redemption. (2) Because it is His Eternal Sonship that required everywhere to be made prominent. (3) But it must be remembered that on certain occasions, when His dignity required it, the supreme appellation is unsparingly applied to Him: for instance, the GOD *Who is* OVER ALL.

Rom. ix. 5.

15. What reflections arise from the whole?

It may be said generally:

(1) That the names of our Lord are really the best and sometimes the only demonstrative texts to be quoted in Christian theology.

(2) That their application in the New Testament should strictly govern our use.

(3) That the study of them should impress upon us the profound reverence which belongs to the *Name which is above every name*. Adjectives of familiarity or endearment should be cautiously used, even in the language of Christian devotion.

Pet. i. 8. hil. ii. 9.

CHAPTER IV.

The Finished Atonement.

Preliminary.

1. What is meant by Finished Atonement?

The result of that mediatorial intervention the processes of which, on earth and in heaven, we have been tracing.

2. What is the force of finished?

It means that it is regarded as an objectively accomplished fact: (1) thus distinguished from its VIRTUAL accomplishment since the foundation of the world; and (2) from the SUBJECTIVE benefit of it to mankind and believers.

3. Thus viewed, how is the atonement to be defined?

It has, and must have, two definitions, according to the more general and the more strict sense of the term atonement: in other words, its Old-Testament and its New-Testament significance.

4. What is that difference?

The popular idea regards atonement as that which is offered to propitiate Divine wrath; that is the levitical sense. Its meaning in the New Testament, like that of καταλλαγή in St. Paul, is the resulting reconciliation between God and man. The difference is between the MEANS and the RESULT.

5. Then what is the true definition as including both?

The reconciliation between God and the human race through the vicarious mediation and sacrificial obedience of Jesus Christ. This combines the two.

6. Define the terms of the definition.

(1) The first part of it lays stress on the relation of the

vicarious atonement to the RACE: there is nothing vicarious, strictly speaking, in its application to the individual.

(2) The reconciliation includes God and man: it is between these two. There is literally no doctrine of ATONEMENT (perhaps in English at-one-ment) on any other supposition. Man alone reconciled to God is an anomaly.

(3) The sacrificial obedience refers to the active and passive offering of Himself by the Son to the Father as instead of the passive suffering and the active obedience of mankind: both being vicarious as to the race; and in their unity the virtue or the value effecting the reconciliation.

(4) But the term THROUGH must be connected with mediation as well as sacrificial obedience: THROUGH the mediation itself God shows that He is reconciled: as having provided the propitiation THROUGH which alone His love could be revealed.

(5) The term vicarious implies, however, a redemption of the race: it is not only vicarious presentation TO God, but FOR man also; and the race is redeemed.

7. How may we systematise and simplify all this?

The atonement is to be considered, first, in its essence as offered by Christ and accepted by God; secondly, in its threefold result as the expiation of sin, as the reconciliation of God and man, and as man's redemption.

I.

The Atonement as Presented.

1. What aspects of our subject belong to this?

Those only which concern the necessity, the reality and the perfection of the Redeemer's sacrificial oblation.

2. How may these be shewn?

In the relation of God and man, demanding atonement; the relation of Christ and man, making it possible; and the relation of God and Christ, rendering it perfect.

§ 1. God and the Sinner.

1. What is the ground of the necessity of Christ's oblation?

The relation between man and his Creator is disturbed by sin; and the atonement is the method of its restoration.

2. Must this necessarily be by atonement?

Why it must be thus is an inquiry beyond our faculties. Nor are human analogies sufficient to solve it. Enough that the voice of conscience is heard asking, *How should man be just with God?* and revelation gives one only answer. Job x. 2.

3. But does not the heart of sinful man rely upon the sovereign compassion of God towards his misery?

Never in its uncorrupted impulses. Deep in the human spirit is lodged a dread of God as offended, and not merely of His power to punish. This latter is awakened first in conviction of sin, but with pardon and renewal comes the profounder consciousness of the sinfulness of sin in itself.

4. Then revelation does not declare this necessity?

It does not formally state or prove this; but everywhere assumes it, as the being of God and the strength of sin are assumed. *If it be possible* is followed by the cross. Matt. xxvi. 39.

5. How is the necessity of atonement more particularly viewed in theological treatment?

By referring it to the law and to the nature of God.

6. How to His law?

That is protected by the Divine justice, which demands reparation to the law itself in the Person of the Lawgiver, and its vindication in His universal government.

7. How to His nature?

That is protected by the Divine holiness, which demands that sin should be put away in order to the sinner's restoration to fellowship with God. The atonement—*to put away sin* (εἰς ἀθέτησιν)—has effect both as to this and the former. Heb. ix. 26.

8. But may not both these ends be met by the forgiveness of sheer omnipotence?

This has been the leading contention of all opponents of the doctrine of atonement. But, even if unconditional forgiveness were consistent with the Divine justice, the Divine holiness would require that the sinner's nature should be changed in order to fellowship with it.

9. Does the word of revelation make a distinction between these two kinds of necessity?

(1) The justice of God guarding His law, and His holiness guarding His nature, are one in God Himself: it is He who demands the mediation of atonement in our return to His law and to Himself; and the Christian atonement secures both.

(2) But the scripture adopts these two methods of teaching the doctrine; which, a unity in itself, runs in two distinct lines of phraseology: one teaching our restoration to God's favour, and the other our recovery to His holiness.

10. How is our definition shaped at this point?

The atonement is the Divine provision for annulling human sin both as guilt and as defilement.

§ 2. Christ and the Sinner.

1. What relation does the atonement reveal between Christ and man the object of His intervention?

The Incarnate Son is, though with a certain difference, the substitute, the representative, and the other self of men.

2. How may that certain difference be viewed?

With respect to the race, to the church, and to the individual: a distinction, however, which must be cautiously used.

3. How with respect to the race of mankind?

Christ is most absolutely the vicarious Redeemer of the world: what we now call human nature He assumed and saved. As to this the vicariousness is express, and ἀντί is the

preposition: *Himself man, Christ Jesus, Who gave Himself a ransom for all.* In His own words *a ransom for many* (ἀντί). 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. Matt. xx. 28.

4. How as to His body, the church?

Here the representative character almost excludes the substitutionary. *One died for all, therefore all died,* and the preposition is ὑπερ, on behalf of. And in this sense He is gone *to appear before the face of God for us.* 2 Cor. 5. 14. Heb. ix. 24.

5. And as to the individual?

There is more than either the vicarious or the representative character: the believer is one with Christ by a mystical union. As in St. Paul's *I have been crucified with Christ,* and *that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings.* Gal. ii. 20. Phil. iii. 10.

§ 3. God in Christ.

1. What does this imply?

That the Divinity of our Lord's Person gave an infinite value to the offering which as perfect Man He presented for men. His blood is, reverently speaking, called by God indirectly through the apostle *His own blood.* Acts xx. 28.

2. How does scripture express this?

During the process the Father's word is: *This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased.* And after the accomplishment it is said that *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.* But generally the fact that He who died for us is the Son of God is supposed to speak enough: He *gave Himself!* The blood and the life rise into HIMSELF. Matt. xvii. 5. 2 Cor. v. 19. 1 Tim. ii. 6.

3. How does the distinction of the two natures in Christ affect the doctrine?

He accomplished a perfect obedience in our fallen nature, and so *condemned sin in the flesh:* not only as *an offering for sin,* but also as showing perfect love to God and man in retrieved human nature. This, however, He did not for Himself, but as God in the flesh. For whose benefit but man's? Rom. viii. 3

4. How is the term Merit to be understood?

(1) It is the term by which theology expresses the value

laid upon the offering of the Incarnate Son by the Father: that
1 Pet. i. 19. Eph. v. 2. value being set against human sin. (2) Similarly it speaks of the VIRTUE of the atonement, corresponding with the personal merit of Him who offered it. (3) And both
Eph. iv. 32. it sometimes expresses by FOR THE SAKE OF Christ, a phrase which literally is not found, any more than the other two, in the New Testament.

II.

The Atonement Viewed as in its Result.

1. How may this be analysed?

As to God its effect is expressed as propitiation; as to God and man reconciliation; as to man alone redemption.

2. Can these be separated?

Though the terms run into each other, this distinction will be found a great help to the understanding of the phraseology of the New Testament, and therefore of the doctrine of the atonement taught by it.

§ 1. Propitiation.

1. What is the meaning of this term?

The one Greek word ἱλασκέσθαι divides into two in translation. In propitiation God is supposed to be brought near again (PROPE). In expiation, the sin is hidden from His view. God is propitiated; and sin is expiated or cancelled or annulled as guilt by being COVERED from His sight (the Hebrew word for atonement).

2. In what connections is the term used?

Always in close relation with the Highpriestly sacrifice.

(1) Christ is *a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of*
Heb. ii. 17. *the people* (ἱλασκέσθαι, wrongly translated reconciliation).

(2) He was *set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by*
Rom. iii. 25. *His blood* (ἱλαστηρίον, the propitiatory covering, or mercy-seat).

(3) And He is now in His own person *the propitiation for*
1 John ii. 2. *our sins* in heaven (ἱλασμός).

(4) What is perhaps the last word on the subject repeats

this of His whole mission. *And sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins.* In all His work He is the ἱλασμός. 1 John iv. 10.

3. Are sinners said to propitiate the justice or wrath of God?

(1) Certainly not His justice, which cannot be propitiated, but must like His love be satisfied.

(2) Nor are we, as receiving the atonement, said to propitiate or appease the Divine displeasure; but to avail ourselves of the expiation which God has provided.

(3) For God Himself, and Christ our high priest, are in the passages just quoted the personal subjects of the verb propitiate. Rather Christ propitiates, and God reconciles to Himself.

§ 2. Reconciliation.

1. How is the term reconciliation introduced?

Strictly speaking only by St. Paul, who uses it in three relations, which must be carefully collated.

(1) *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. We were reconciled to God through the death of His Son.* Here it is a past transaction; and the reconciliation was once for all effected through the cross. 2 Cor. v. 19. Rom. v. 10.

(2) The gospel is the *ministry of reconciliation,* and to receive it is to have *received the reconciliation.* 2 Cor. v. 18. Rom. v. 11.

(3) This reconciliation as preached is distinguished from the peace and salvation and life which follow its reception. It is the ground of the appeal: *Be ye reconciled to God.* 2 Cor. v. 20.

2. Is not God always the Reconciler and not the Reconciled?

He is said to *reconcile all things unto Himself*—to be interpreted by *the world unto Himself*,—because the way of restoration in Christ *Our Peace* is from Him. *It pleased the Father.* Col. i. 20. 2 Cor. v. 19. Eph. ii. 14. Col. i. 19.

3. Then what definition of the atonement arises here?

It is the restoration of fellowship between God and mankind through the mediation of Christ who was *made to be sin on our behalf*, and who suffered *that He might bring us to God.* 2 Cor. v. 21. 1 Pet. iii. 18.

4. But this seems to make God alone the reconciled?

And that is the truth in the objective atonement: our personal reconciliation belongs to its application by the Spirit.

5. Will the scriptural use of the term sanction this?

It is not used concerning the atonement in the Old Testament. But in the Apocrypha we find it: *They besought the merciful Lord to be reconciled with His servants.* A kindred word is used of David: *Wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his master?* And by our Lord, *First be reconciled to thy brother.* St. Paul uses the very same word, *Or else be reconciled to her husband.* Now in all these cases the reconciliation must be mutual, at least: if not specially of the party with whom the reconciliation is to take place.

2 Macc. viii. 29.
1 Sam. xxix. 4.
Matt. v. 15.
1 Cor. vii. 11.

§ 8. Redemption.

1. How is this term related to those which precede?

They refer rather to the sin in man and the attributes in God which rendered the atonement necessary: this refers rather to the sinners themselves as redeemed.

2. Does it not introduce a new idea?

It regards sin as bondage, Christ as a deliverer, and His atonement as the paying down of a ransom-price.

3. Has this word price an allusion to sin as debt?

Not precisely: wherever the value of our Lord's oblation is mentioned it is not as set against an amount due from us, but as the price at which we ourselves have been bought.

1 Pet. i. 18, 19

4. Bought out or released that is from bondage?

From the bondage of sin: first as a penalty and then as a power. Satan and death are only subordinate.

5. How is the Lord's sacrifice related to the former?

(1) He gave His life *a ransom for many;* and *We have our redemption through His blood;* and *He gave Himself a ransom for all;* He entered in *having obtained eternal redemption.*

Matt. xx. 28.
Eph. i. 7.
1 Tim. ii. 6.

(2) But all these are shewn to be synonymous with the atonement or propitiation: *Through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, Whom God set forth to be a propitiation.* In this and other passages the ideas of sacrifice and redemption blend.

Heb. ix. 12.
Rom. iii. 24, 25.

(3) But always the redemption contains a ransom-price or λύτρον for persons or the world viewed as all men.

6. And how is it related to the latter, or the power of sin?

(1) In the Old Testament we have the idea of a GOEL, or kinsman, who is obliged *to redeem that which his brother sold.* Lev. xxv. 5.

(2) In the New Testament our Redeemer not only releases from bondage, or *the curse of the law*, but also purchases back our lost inheritance of the Holy Spirit or the *blessing of Abraham.* The two aspects of our redemption are inseparable. Gal. iii. 13, 14.

(3) And by the power of His Spirit Christ purposes to *redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself.* Titus ii. 14.

7. Is this redemption, as objective, for all?

It is absolutely a universal redemption.

(1) Like every word belonging to the atonement, this one is as wide as sin or the sinning race: sin and redemption are correlative, and throughout the doctrine have the same extent.

(2) The first and the last passages in the New Testament are very clear. *The Son of man came to give His life ■ ransom for many* is quoted, as it were, and strengthened by St. Paul in a unique saying, *Who gave Himself a ransom for all:* here the πολλῶν becomes πάντων, the ψυχήν becomes ἑαυτόν, and the λύτρον becomes ἀντίλυτρον. Matt. xx. 28. 1 Tim. ii. 6.

8. But the term is often used in a more limited sense?

Yes; like reconciliation in this. But unlike it in that another class of words is sometimes employed to express the application of redemption to the church and individuals.

9. Which are they?

Terms which have not the central idea of PRICE or λύτρον in them: such as deliver, purchase, release, rescue, all applied to the saving effect of redemption. Gal. i. 4. Heb. ii. 15. 1 Thess. i. 10.

10. Then, after all, is not redemption both universal and particular?

There is, as it used to be said, redemption by price and

by power. The living God is *the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe.* The names Saviour and Redeemer are really the same: the former for His people, the latter for the world.

1 Tim. iv. 10.

III.

Historical.

1. How may we trace here the current of doctrine?

By showing how from age to age the definitions of the atonement have varied under the influence of a few leading ideas, more or less affecting the whole economy of grace.

2. What was it in the ante-Nicene age?

No formal definition was laid down; and the beginnings of error appear. But the doctrine was generally that of a substitutionary sacrifice offered for the human race.

3. How did those errors begin to develope?

(1) Some held that the sacrifice offered to God was also a ransom-price paid down to Satan: either as righteously discharging his claim or Divinely rescuing the race from his lawful power. This notion was long and widely diffused.

(2) The sacrifice began to be regarded, by Augustine first, as only for the saved; that is, really, for elected individuals: not for the race. As a pendant and opposite, Origen had early made its benefit overflow to all evil in the universe. He read the text, not *by the grace of God*, but *outside of God* (χώρις), *He should taste death for all*, not *for every man.*

Heb. ii. 9.

(3) The Gnostic conceptions of the atonement as rescue from the evil principle in matter are beyond our subject.

4. How was the truth held in the patristic age?

It prospered under the happy influence of the decisions as to the Person of Christ. And the best of the early fathers laid stress on penalty annulling guilt; on the possibility of the vicarious endurance of penalty; on the value stamped by His Divinity on the human suffering and death which His humanity enabled the Redeemer to undergo.

5. What lax view, not absolutely error, began to appear?

From Origen and Augustine down to Anselm, in the twelfth century, there was a strong tendency to regard the atonement as an expedient of the omnipotent will of God: in the case of Augustine, this was in profound harmony with his predestinarian doctrine of sin and redemption.

6. What was the Anselmic crisis?

Anselm's treatise CUR DEUS HOMO stamped on the doctrine the idea of the Redeemer's voluntary discharge of a necessary obligation; the necessity in God Himself of satisfaction to Divine justice; and the MERIT of Christ as more than sufficient for any debt or obligation possibly to be incurred.

7. What effect had this emphatic note?

It has been the main element in all the formulas of Christendom: Tridentine, Lutheran, Reformed mostly agreeing as to the absolute necessity of atoning satisfaction and the sufficiency of the merit of Christ. Sin was measured rather by the dignity of God than by the insignificance of man.

8. How was the influence of this fundamental principle seen?

The atonement of Christ being fixed to be the payment or discharge of an obligation, theories variously divided.

(1) The payment may be exact: then follows the doctrine of the Calvinistic Reformed, that Christ died for the elect, whose precise punishment He bore and whose failing obedience He supplies, both consummated in one sacrifice.

(2) It may be superabundant; and then follows the treasury formed by the superfluity for the remission of individual sins and their temporal penalty: as it were by an atonement added to the atonement.

(3) It may be sufficient indefinitely: then comes in the theory technically called ACCEPTILATIO, from a Roman forensic term which signified acquittance without exact equivalent but on grounds held sufficient. Thence arose the Arminian doctrine, which laid stress on the compassion of God accepting the Son's selfsacrifice instead of the punishment due.

(4) It may be regarded as required only or mainly for the

vindication of the law. Grotius and the later Arminians held this view : called the rectoral or government theory.

9. Meanwhile what other effect had it ?

To excite an opposite tendency, represented first by Abælard and continuing to the present day : that of denying any necessity in God for atonement or reparation to His law ; and reducing Christ's sacrifice to an exhibition of the Divine love in its absolute and most moving form.

10. Was this held by the Socinians ?

Not precisely : these went much further. They denied the Divinity of Christ and reduced the reconciliation to a moral effect of Christ's teaching, and redemption to an exercise of a prerogative of mercy committed to him in heaven.

11. What does Socinian theology urge against the truth ?

(1) That God's will must not be limited by the thought of a necessary atonement. But God Himself has answered this.

(2) That substitution is immoral. But that is not true, in the natural economy ; and, in the supernatural, substitution is glorified into mystical fellowship with Christ, our Head.

(3) That repentance is in scripture the sufficient ground of pardon. But the gospel of all ages is based on an underlying reconciliation, through which alone repentance is accepted.

12. What are our safeguards ?

(1) There is no sound doctrine that does not measure the evil of sin by the infinite value of the Son of God.

(2) The qualifying theories which make the atonement only an exhibition of selfsacrifice in Christ, and of rectoral justice in God, are perfectly sound only when they rest upon the deeper foundation of an eternal necessity of atonement.

(3) The precise connection between Christ's offering and the expiation of sin is beyond the limits of human reason : reserved for the trust of faith.

2 Cor. ii. 16. Heb. x. 30. (4) The provision of the atonement is finally the test of every man's probation.

BOOK VI.

The Application of Redemption.

I. THE HOLY SPIRIT AS ADMINISTRATOR.

II. THE CALL OF THE GOSPEL.

III. PREVENIENT GRACE AND CONDITIONS OF SALVATION.

IV. THE ESTATE OF GRACE.

V. THE PROBATION OF THE GOSPEL.

VI. THE ETHICS OF REDEMPTION.

VII. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK VI.

The Holy Spirit's Administration of the Christian Covenant.

Preliminary.

1. What is signified by this general title?

That we now pass from the finished work of Christ to its application by the Holy Ghost through the Gospel.

2. In what other terms might this be expressed?

Sometimes the whole doctrine of human salvation is called Soteriology: objective, as including what Christ has accomplished once for all; subjective, as including the means and measures of its personal appropriation.

3. Point out the propriety of the phrase here used.

It has been seen that the Divine purpose of redemption was gradually accomplished in the establishment of a covenant of which Jesus Christ was the mediator. Having ratified that covenant with His blood, the Redeemer commits it to the Holy Spirit that He may carry out all its provisions according to the will of its Divine author.

4. How may this whole subject be distributed?

(1) The Holy Spirit in His agency as administrator.

(2) His proclamation to the world, or call in the Gospel.

(3) Prevenient grace and the conditions of personal salvation: conversion, repentance, faith.

(4) The blessings of the Christian covenant in the estate of grace: righteousness, sonship, sanctification.

(5) The probationary character of the Christian covenant.

(6) The ethics of the Gospel of redemption.

(7) The Christian Church as the sphere of the Spirit's administration.

Chapter I.

The Holy Spirit as Administrator.

1. What have we already learnt concerning the Holy Spirit?

That He is a Divine person consubstantial with the Father and the Son; that, like the Son, He was an agent in creation, and is ever-active in the providential government of the world; that He has been specially connected with the history of redemption, as the Spirit of Christ in the prophets, as the author and finisher of our Lord's human nature, and as the unction descending upon the Redeemer that it might flow from Him to His people.

2. In what relation do we now regard Him?

As a person sent from the Father through the intercession of the Son to carry on His work to the end of time.

§ 1. Temporal Mission.

1. What term do we use for this agency of the Spirit?

It is His temporal mission as distinguished from His eternal procession: just as we distinguish between the Son's eternal generation and His incarnation in time. *Whom I will send unto you from the Father . . . Which proceedeth from the Father.* (Ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς . . . ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται. And of both the pronoun ἐκεῖνος is used, He.)

John xv. 26.

2. When did the Spirit's temporal mission begin?

On the day of Pentecost.

3. But have we not marked His presence, like that of the Son, in the Old Testament?

The three Divine Persons are more or less revealed in the ancient economy; but their offices are not clearly and fully distinguished until the last days. The Son and the Spirit were alike in the Old Testament THE PROMISE (τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν in both); and are alike in the New

Acts i. 4, xiii. 32, 33. Gal. iii. 14.

sent as fulfilment of the promise. *When the fulness of the time came God* SENT FORTH *His Son . . . and because ye are sons God* SENT FORTH *the Spirit of His Son into our hearts* (ἐξαπέστειλεν in both). Of the Son: *God hath fulfilled the same . . . in that He raised up Jesus.* Of the Spirit: *Having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath shed forth this.* Gal. iv. 4, 6. Acts xiii. 33. Acts ii. 33.

4. Is not the Holy Spirit spoken of throughout the Gospels?

(1) In relation to the person of Christ He is already come: whatever our Lord is or does as the representative of man He is and does as under the Spirit; while whatever He is and does as the representative of God He is and does as the Eternal Son. In the Gospels the Spirit is the Spirit of Jesus.

(2) But as to the administration of the finished work the Spirit is always spoken of as yet to come. Of all the sayings of Jesus concerning Him St. John's words hold good: *This spake He of the Spirit, which they that believed on Him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet* given; *because Jesus was not yet glorified.* As the great gift of heaven He *was not yet.* John vii. 39.

5. Why was the Spirit's coming dependent on the Lord's glorification?

(1) Because the disclosure of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity, as perfecting the revelation of the Triune God, had then its set time: *When the day of Pentecost was now come.* The Godhead was made known in the work of Christ. Acts ii. 1.

(2) Because the glorification of Christ was His death—*Now is the Son of Man glorified*—and the death of Christ must finish His work before that work could be revealed in its full significance and applied to the world by the Spirit. John xiii. 31.

(3) Because the glorification of Christ in heaven began the intercession, of which the firstfruits was the mission of the Comforter: *It is expedient for you that I go away: if I go I will send Him unto you.* John xvi. 7.

(4) Because, in fact, the glorification of Jesus, or the revelation of His true character and glory, was to be the work of the Spirit: *He shall glorify Me.* John xvi. 14.

§ 2. The Dispensation of the Spirit.

1. In what sense, if any, is the new covenant a dispensation of the Spirit?

The term used by St. Paul is *ministration of the Spirit* (διακονία, not οἰκονομία). It is not that the Spirit ministers but that He is ministered. We are not to understand by this phrase that the new covenant is an economy only under the rule of the Spirit: there is no separate dispensation of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost respectively.

2 Cor. iii. 8.

2. In what sense is it a ministration of the Spirit?

As the ministry of the Gospel is the medium of the Spirit's operation: giving the *life* of the Spirit in contrast with the *condemnation* and *death* of the law; the law being a body of statutes *written and engraven on stones*, which statutes fallen human nature could not keep.

2 Cor. iii. 6, 9, 7.

3. Is then the Spirit both the Giver and the Gift in the dispensation of the Gospel?

He is, like the Son, in His Divine dignity supreme, and gives: *All these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as He will.* And, like the Son, in the economy of grace He is subordinate, and is given: *But to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal.*

1 Cor. xii. 11, 7.

4. May the Spirit be termed the head of the Christian dispensation during Christ's absence?

Christ is never absent: *I am with you alway* is as determinate as *If I go not away* and *Whom the heaven must receive.* But the Spirit is the agent of His indwelling power.

Matt. xxviii. 20. John xvi. 7. Acts iii. 21.

5. Is He not the representative of Christ as absent in His human nature and as present in His Divine nature?

The distinction is never made in the New Testament: in this sense also Christ is not divided. We may say, however, that the Redeemer's functions on earth are discharged by the Spirit, and His functions in heaven by Himself.

§ 3. The Spirit as Representative of Jesus.

1. Does not then the Saviour promise the Spirit as His own deputy?

Not in express terms; He calls Him, however, *Another Paraclete*, as if the Spirit's agency was to be additional to His own; but not His vicar or deputy, for He adds *I will come unto you.* St. Paul makes the Lord and the Spirit one in presence and operation: *Now the Lord is the Spirit*, in the same sense as *I and the Father are one.* John xiv. 16. John xiv. 18 2 Cor. iii. 17. John x. 30.

2. How then is the Spirit the Lord's representative?

He reveals generally His person and work, as *the Spirit of the truth*, of the truth *as truth is in Jesus;* by His virtue the Saviour is an internal presence to the believer; and He pleads Christ's cause, as His Paraclete, against the world or before it. John xiv. 17 Eph. iv. 21.

3. As to the first: Are the revelation of the person and that of the work one?

There is now little distinction: our Lord said, *He shall glorify Me; for He shall take of Mine, and shall declare it unto you.* Hereafter He will reveal His person alone: *as He is.* John xvi. 14 1 John iii. 2.

4. How is the Spirit the revealer of Christ's person?

By giving faith the conviction or evidence that the Son of man is the Son of God with glory. *No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit.* 1 Cor. xii. 3.

5. How does He reveal His work?

(1) By unfolding through the apostles the full import of the redeeming offices. *He shall guide you into all the truth.* John xvi. 13.

(2) By revealing to the believer the meaning of His words, the virtue of His sacrifice, and the power of His grace in the heart. *It is the Spirit that beareth witness.* 1 John v. 6.

(3) By being the internal seal or assurance of personal faith: *ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.* Eph. i. 13.

6. By this inward assurance alone does the Spirit represent Jesus internally?

No: in the mystery of His indwelling He makes the personal Redeemer an indwelling presence: the new life of the soul. Compare the two passages: *The Spirit of life in Christ Jesus* and *He that hath the Son hath the life.*

Rom. viii. 2. 1 John v. 12.

7. How does He represent Christ to the world?

It is His office to *convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.* But in each of these He pleads the cause of Christ, Who through Him pleads His own cause. *Of sin, because they believe not on Me:* sin is now the rejection of Jesus. *Of righteousness, because I go to the Father:* the righteousness of the crucified and risen Redeemer is the only ground of human hope for righteousness. *Of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged:* the Lord through the Spirit demands His own and draws all men from Satan to Himself.

John xvi. 8–11.

§ 4. The Spirit as Person and as Influence.

1. Is the distinction between the Spirit's person and influence always plain?

Not always. It is clear when His influences are expressed in the language of symbols and figures, such as those of fire, water, anointing, sealing; but sometimes His operations are meant when the term Spirit is used alone.

2. How is the Divine personality of the Spirit indisputably expressed in New Testament phraseology?

In those passages which speak of Him as *the Spirit of God*, or *of His Son*, or *of the Christ;* in those also which term Him *the Holy Spirit*, or *the Spirit*, emphatically with the article.

Rom. viii. 9. Gal. iv. 6. 1 Pet. i. 11. John xiv. 26. Acts xi. 15. Acts ii. 4.

3. Is πνεῦμα or πνεῦμα ἅγιον ever used of the influences of the Spirit only?

Of His influences, certainly; but never without implying His presence as the source of them in the heart. We cannot sever spiritual gifts from the Spirit. As he that hath the Son hath the life, so he that hath the Spirit hath His spiritual

influences. Mark the blending of the two: *They were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.* Here we must think of the same Person in both parts of the verse. Acts ii. 4.

4. How far does the presence or absence of the Greek article decide the question of His personality?

Not invariably; for the term Holy Spirit as a proper name became independent of the article. As there are adjectives which may be used whenever the person is not included —as in *comparing spiritual things with spiritual*— we do well to connect the person with His influence in such passages as *be filled with the Spirit*, where the person is included. 1 Cor. ii. 13. Eph. v. 18.

5. What bearing has this on the various offices of the Spirit in administering the Gospel?

It gives reality and vividness to our views of His work— as that of a person one with the Father and the Son and yet distinct from Both—in the whole economy of redemption. This will appear under the several heads of that work.

6. Which is the most prominent official name of the Spirit?

That of *the Paraclete*, παράκλητος, which is literally Advocatus, Advocate or Helper, specially within the heart. This is Comforter in the ancient sense of Strengthener. John xvi. 7.

7. What is the peculiarity of this name?

It connects the offices of the Son and of the Spirit in a very impressive way. (1) Our Lord had described Himself as a representative of the Father and an intercessor with Him on behalf of His people; when about to depart He promises *Another Comforter* or Paraclete. (2) He Himself is our *Advocate with the Father* or Paraclete. (3) The Spirit is an intercessor within the hearts of the saints. (4) Thus the voice of the Advocate or Pleader within the veil of the spirit answers to the voice of the Advocate or Pleader within the veil of heaven; *He maketh intercession* within us and thus *helpeth our infirmity*. John xiv. 16. 1 John ii. 1. Rom. viii. 27, 26.

8. What is said of the manifestation of the Spirit?

That each of His gifts is, as a φανέρωσις, spiritual proof of His indwelling: God manifest in the spirit.

Chapter II.

Vocation, or the Calling of the Spirit.

1. What is to be understood by this phrase?

The whole work of the Spirit as making known to man the common redemption and offering to him its blessings.

2. How may we distribute the subject?

We may consider the call as universal and indirect; then as historical in revelation before Christ; and finally as perfect in the proclamation and offer of the Gospel.

§ 1. The Universal and Indirect Call.

1. May the call, like redemption, be regarded as universal?

We are bound by every principle to believe that in some way—whether known to us or not—all who fell in the first Adam shall know that in the Second Adam a Saviour has been provided for them.

2. In what ways may the call be said to be universal?

The Son of God was the *True light which lighteth every man coming into the world.* The Gentiles are said to *shew the work of the law written in their hearts.* God *left not Himself without witness.* In the beginning the mysterious prophecy or threatening was, *My Spirit shall not always strive with man:* a saying which dimly expresses the undoubted truth of a universal visitation or restraint of the Divine Spirit. Finally, the broken traditions of primitive revelation were a sound that *went into all the earth*, various echoes of the Divine voice calling the nations *to seek God, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us.*

John i. 9. Rom. ii. 15. Acts xiv. 17. Gen. vi. 3.

Rom. x. 18. Acts xvii. 27.

§ 2. The Historical Call before Christ.

1. What is our fundamental principle here?

The revelation of the Divine purpose was gradual, through special lines of descent and a particular people. The direct call may be regarded as running parallel with this. Both the purpose and the gradual revelation of it are called a mystery.

2. Then the election preceded the call?

Assuredly; for God chose out both men and people first, and then called them. In the Gospel it is otherwise: men are called first, and then elected.

3. Were the leading historical calls independent of character?

By no means: witness the earliest instances of Cain and Abel; the sons of Noah; Abraham and Jacob, and others, who were or became true servants of God.

4. What is the specific difference between the Old-Testament call and that of the New?

The ancient call was chiefly that of a nation or people, the calling of individuals being subordinate; the Gospel call is mainly that of the individual, the national being subordinate.

5. What is the peculiar importance of the call of Abraham?

It was the great crisis in history; which determined the course of historical revelation to a special race, and at the same time prophesied a future and universal call.

6. Were the nations outside of the first covenant altogether abandoned?

Only as to outward revelation. There is a gradually strengthening prediction of the future call of the Gentiles, ending with *My name shall be great among the nations.* Meanwhile, as St. Paul afterwards says, God *suffered all the nations to walk in their own ways.* Into this mystery we cannot penetrate: but *He left not Himself without witness.*

Mal. i. 11. Acts xiv. 16, 17.

§ 3. The Gospel Call.

1. What is the Gospel Call proper, as commencing with the personal ministry of Jesus?

It may be regarded as threefold: the proclamation of the glad tidings; the command to submit to Christ as Lord; and the offer of personal salvation through Him.

2. How does the first appear in the New Testament?

In a variety of ways. First came the *proclaiming* (κηρύσσειν) *the kingdom of heaven* or *the Gospel of the kingdom*, with the command to *repent and believe in the Gospel;* then *preaching the Gospel* or *the Word* or *Jesus;* and, finally, *the ministry of the reconciliation.*

Matt. iii. 2. Matt. iv. 23. Mark i. 15. Acts viii. 25. Acts viii. 4. Acts v. 42. 2 Cor. v. 18.

3. What are the uses of the word Gospel?

The word (εὐαγγέλιον) means in the New Testament a joyful announcement or *good tidings* generally: *the Gospel* in many relations, *of God, of Christ, of our salvation, of the grace of God.* The verb evangelise (εὐαγγελίζειν) is used for the preaching of those tidings. The word has been thought to be once used for the narrative of our Lord's history as the Author of salvation: *the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.* Certainly it was afterwards used with this meaning; and thus this one word has become the most central and the most important title of the whole mission and work of the Redeemer.

Acts xv. 7. Rom. xv. 16. Rom. i. 16. Eph. i. 13. Acts xx. 24. Mark i. 1.

4. Is submission to Christ part of the Gospel message?

An essential part: He is *the Author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him.* Repentance toward God includes, when the way of salvation is declared, the humble acknowledgment of Christ's mediatorial authority.

Heb. v. 9.

5. What is the offer of personal salvation?

The promise of acceptance to all who believe; the commendation of Christ as an all-sufficient Saviour; the exhortation to receive Him, enforced by many arguments; and, finally, the present offer of Divine grace to assist both the repentance and the faith.

6. Are all these necessary to the preaching of the Gospel?

Many of the details will be filled up in the teaching that follows when preaching has done its work. But no one of these main characteristics can be omitted in a sound evangelical ministry. All are included in apostolical preaching.

7. To whom is this important office committed?

To the Christian company universally, but specially to men set apart for that purpose. *Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations. They went about preaching the word. How shall they preach, except they be sent?* Matt. xxviii. 19. Acts viii. 4. Rom. x. 15.

8. Is the call of the Gospel effectual?

It is effectual in the purpose of God: that is, He who sends it *willeth that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth.* It is actually effectual also, inasmuch as the grace accompanying it impresses every hearer and gives every man the power to obey. But it may be resisted: *Ye will not come unto Me! Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost!* 1 Tim. ii. 4. John v. 40. Acts vii. 51

9. But are there not reprobate sinners foredoomed to be called in vain?

The reprobate, ἀδόκιμοι, are those, and those only, who *did not like to retain God in their knowledge;* who *resist the truth;* and who have lost the indwelling Lord: *Know ye not as to your own selves that Jesus Christ is in you? except ye be reprobate.* The word implies failure under test. Rom. i. 28. 2 Tim. iii. 8. 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

10. Is it not said that in Antioch they believed who were ordained to eternal life?

Compare with this: *Seeing ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles.* After the wilful refusal and rejection of the Jews, those among the Gentiles are referred to who τεταγμένοι ἦσαν, *were rightly ordered for*, or *disposed to, eternal life.* Acts xiii. 48. Acts xiii. 46.

11. Are not true Christians the Called, implying that their call was necessarily effectual?

Three terms are used, each of which is adopted to describe generally the Christian estate: the Called, κλητοί; the Chosen or Elect, ἐκλεκτοί; and the Faithful, πιστοί. But when they are connected they explain and limit each other: the elect have yielded to the call, for *many are called, but few chosen;* and of those elect only such as prove *faithful unto death* are saved. Those who finally overcome with the Lamb are the *called and chosen and faithful.*

Matt. xxii. 14.
Rev. ii. 10.
Rev. xvii. 14.

12. Is there any distinction between a merely outward call and an effectual internal call?

There is none in Scripture; but there is undoubtedly a secret voice of the Spirit which speaks inwardly what is outwardly heard. Both calls, however, may be resisted.

13. What is the teaching of St. Paul on this subject in his Three Chapters of the Epistle to the Romans?

They deal with the Jews, who perverted the truth of their ancient national election: refusing to believe that any of their nation could be cut off, and that the Gentiles should enter into their privileges. Hence:

(1.) In the central chapter of the three, the tenth, it is shown that in the Gospel *there is no distinction between Jew and Greek: for the same Lord is Lord of all.*

Rom. x. 12.

(2.) In the ninth the leading thought is that a national election is one thing, the election of individuals another: *the children of the promise are reckoned for a seed.* Both in judgment and in mercy God is righteous: the former He exercises after *much longsuffering;* and the latter He abundantly shewed in that He *called, not from the Jews only, but also from the Gentiles,* individuals who should receive His salvation.

Rom. ix. 8, 22, 24.

(3.) In the eleventh it is seen that national election is lost in individual. *God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that He might have mercy upon all. All Israel shall be saved:* all the true Israel, whether Jews or Gentiles.

Rom. xi. 32, 26.

Chapter III.

Prevenient Grace and the Conditions of Salvation.

1. What subjects are included under this head?

All that belongs to the work of the Spirit in helping man to prepare himself for full acceptance in Christ or personal salvation: as it were in the outer court of the temple.

2. Are not these preparations the work of the Spirit alone?

The beginnings of grace are before any human will to good; but human co-operation must accompany every stage of this process.

3. Is man's co-operation with grace more marked in this process than afterwards?

(1) When the blessings of salvation are imparted, those who receive them are perfectly passive: justification, regeneration, sanctification are acts administered by the Spirit alone. (2) In the state of salvation, the believer must co-work with grace in order to retain his privilege and reach its perfection. (3) But the difference is this, that in the work of preparation the man still has a self and may co-operate, while in the regenerate estate his life is the life of Christ within him, and the term co-operate is not used with the same propriety.

4. What is the theological order in this department?

We have prevenient grace and its relation to free will; and then the conditions or terms of salvation [redacted] complied with through that grace.

§ 1. Prevenient Grace.

1. What name connects the Holy Ghost with this subject?

He is called *the Spirit of grace*, even as He is *the Spirit of the truth.* These two appellations strictly harmonise. Heb. x. 29. John xvi. 13.

2. What is grace prevenient?

The effect of God's favour towards undeserving and helpless man: (1) as anticipating or going before man's own desire for it; and (2) as preceding and preparing for the fuller manifestation of grace in pardon and the new life.

3. Where is the final ground of this grace to be sought?

In the virtue of the universal atonement securing a measure of the Spirit's influence to every child of Adam.

4. How may this be said to operate?

(1) As to the object on whom it is exerted, it is restraint upon inherited bias to evil and secret prompting towards good. (2) As to the operation itself, it is the drawing of the obedient and the striving with the disobedient. (3) As to the means used, it is generally the effectual working of the truth through *the demonstration of the Spirit.*

John vi. 44. Acts vii. 51. 1 Cor. ii. 4.

5. Are these influences to be regarded as directing the several faculties of man?

The grace itself is strictly speaking bestowed on the sinner behind these faculties: it is prevenient and therefore accompanies the first exercises of man's mind and heart and will.

6. Does the appeal of the word find as well as bring this grace?

It finds it waiting in the roots of the nature; and is also ready to move upon the will through the feelings which are excited by the truths applied to the understanding.

§ 2. Grace and Freewill.

1. Do Divine grace and the human will co-operate?

In whatever sense there may be co-operation it is between the Spirit and the sinner under His influence.

2. Then in this co-operation grace has the pre-eminence?

Otherwise it would not be prevenient. It has already in the mystery of nature, as redeemed, set the sinner free from any such slavery to sin as would render the Divine call useless.

3. Explain further this freedom and this slavery.

The will is necessarily free, by the very term ; and consciousness asserts this. The theological meaning of bondage is that the unrenewed man has no power as yet to do what he wills. Hence the man who has the free will is bound.

4. How does St. Paul mourn over his slavery?

His mourning shows the effect of prevenient grace ; and has in it the anticipation of coming deliverance.

5. How does Holy Scripture solve the difficulty of reconciling Divine grace and human freedom?

By always regarding *the inward man*, τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, as under grace, and by appealing to a certain secret influence of the Spirit already present. Thus the voice without penetrates to the ear of that inner man to which a preliminary Ephphatha has been already spoken. Rom. vii. 22.

6. Is any difficulty acknowledged in Scripture?

No: its watchword is, both after and before regeneration, *It is God which worketh in you, both to will and to work.* Phil. ii. 13.

§ 3. The Conditions of Salvation.

1. What is meant by the conditions or terms of salvation?

What God requires in the man whom He accepts for Christ's sake, and on whom He freely bestows the blessings of the Gospel of grace.

2. How may we reconcile "What God requires" with "Freely bestows" and "For Christ's sake"?

By remembering: (1) that nothing brought or done by man can have any merit ; (2) that the terms are so ordered as to demand only the removal of what would hinder his receiving blessings already provided ; and (3) that the conditions themselves include the use of a Divine grace enabling the sinner to comply with them.

3. What, then, are these necessary conditions?

They are laid down in many ways; but are all briefly comprehended in one saying: *Repentance toward God, and* Acts xx. 21. *faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.*

4. Are repentance and faith equally necessary?

They are both necessary conditions; but not in the same sense necessary.

5. What is the difference between them?

They may be united as one condition; but, as separated, faith is the instrument or means by which we receive salvation, which repentance is not.

6. But does not repentance embrace the mercy of the Gospel?

It thinks only of sin: its guilt, its misery, and its danger.

7. Does not Scripture sometimes speak of repentance and amendment as all that God requires?

Yes; but it always implies trust in the promises of Divine mercy; which promises and which trust from the beginning of the Bible to the end are based on the covenant of grace in Christ.

8. Was not the publican accepted when he said "God be merciful to me a sinner"? and the prodigal when he returned to his father?

It must be remembered that, in the same Gospel which records these parables, our Lord says, *This cup is the new* Luke xxii. 20. *covenant in My blood, which is shed for you.* The Luke xviii. 13. publican, moreover, cried: *God be propitiated to me* (ἱλάσθητί μοι) *a sinner:* using, near the altar, the language of atoning sacrifice. The Gospels, and the entire Scripture, must be read in the presence of the cross: the one atonement underlies all.

9. How is faith the special means or instrument of salvation?

Because the believer penitently accepts Christ as offered in the Gospel; claims his interest in His sacrifice and intercession; and receives the grace of His Spirit.

10. Can there be such faith without repentance?

Only the penitent feels the need of a Saviour and desires the salvation of his soul.

11. But does not the Saviour speak of other conditions?

Yes: *Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. If any man would come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved.* All these are our Lord's terms of discipleship. Matt. xviii. 3; xvi. 24. Mark xvi. 16.

12. How, then, are repentance and faith the sole conditions?

Those others are really variations of the same two. Conversion is turning from sin in repentance and to God in faith. Self-renunciation and taking up the cross and following Christ are of the very essence of repentance and faith viewed in their relation to the Lord as a Master. And baptism is the outward and visible sign of separation from sin and belief of the Gospel: an economical and ordained condition, not in itself essential.

13. What errors have we here to avoid?

Two, in opposite directions. (1) We must be careful not to import the thought of merit into the sacrifice of repentance which God absolutely demands. The mediæval divines invented a lower kind of merit—not a "merit of worthiness," but a "merit of congruity"—which was supposed to recommend the works of contrition to God. But the supreme condition is that we come to receive unmerited grace. (2) We must be equally on our guard against tampering with the strict idea of condition: there is no absolutely unconditional freeness in the Gospel; and the faith which sinners are sometimes called to exercise without a true and deep repentance is not that which the Spirit acknowledges. *Faith apart from works is dead:* whether in the outer court of preliminary grace or in the sanctuary of the regenerate life. Accordingly, it should be impressed upon all seekers of salvation that God always requires the act or the deep purpose of amendment before He confers the benefit of Christ's atonement. Jas. ii. 26.

§ 4. Conversion.

1. What is the scriptural importance of this term?

It runs through both Testaments as denoting the critical period of a sinner's return from the ways of sin to God: the great change in the moral and religious life.

2. But does it not sometimes signify a return from backsliding?

In the old economy it was so used; since all sin was in some sense apostasy from God already known. It is so used also in respect to Peter's recovery from his fall, *When once thou hast turned again;* and in the encouragement given to him *which converteth a sinner from the error of his way.* But after the Pentecost it is generally employed to signify the first abandonment of heathenism and the service of Satan.

Luke xxii. 32.
Jas. v. 20.

3. What does the term teach as to man's co-operation?

The two notes always are: *Turn Thou me, and I shall be turned;* and *Turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways.* No word in Scripture so consistently represents both the Divine and the human work in the preliminaries of salvation.

Jer. xxxi. 18.
Ezek. xxxiii. 11.

4. How is conversion related to repentance and faith?

The term stands occasionally for either or for both, as in the following passages: *Repent ye therefore and be converted. A great number that believed turned unto the Lord. But are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.*

Acts iii. 19.
Acts xi. 21.
1 Peter ii. 25.

5. What inexact uses of the word are current?

(1) Sometimes it signifies the entire course of religion to the end. (2) Such as make regeneration the very beginning of the spiritual life from God regard conversion as the expression of that life on the part of man. (3) Those who hold that regeneration to be only baptismal would keep the word conversion for a recovery of forfeited baptismal grace. (4) It is very common to speak of conversion as meaning the time

of conscious acceptance with God. (5) Occasionally this great word is employed to denote a mere change of religious opinion.

6. What is its truer and better meaning?

The process, longer or shorter, more or less outwardly troubled, of the soul's turning away from sin and Satan and self to Christ its Saviour. On entering the inner court, and being united to Jesus, its conversion may be said to be ended.

§ 5. Repentance.

1. What is repentance?

The conviction of guilt produced by the Holy Spirit's application of the Divine law to the heart; with the effects of this conviction on the life.

2. By what terms does Scripture define it?

There are three leading ones: the first and most frequently used signifies the change of purpose; the second expresses sorrow or inward contrition; and the third, peculiar to the New Testament, introduces the idea of conviction or reproof as being effectual in the conscience.

3. Illustrate this from the New Testament.

Inverting the order, we have a systematic view of the process from conviction through sorrow to amendment.

(1) *And He, when He is come, will convict the world in respect of sin.* Here is the deep secret of true repentance. *Through law is the knowledge of sin.* John xvi. 8. Rom. iii. 20.

(2) The *broken and contrite heart* of the Old Testament becomes *godly sorrow*, κατὰ θεὸν λύπη. This stands for all its internal emotions through their entire range. Ps. li. 17. 2 Cor. vii. 10.

(3) The Baptist enjoins *fruits worthy of repentance.* These include all the outward expressions of repentance: this is the μεταμέλεσθαι and the μετανοεῖν, which together mean change of mind and purpose and act.

4. But are not all these the fruit of a regenerate life?

No: for, though there is spiritual life in true repentance, it is not yet the life of regeneration.

5. Is repentance then a midway state, between nature and grace?

In a certain sense it is so: there are fruits of a corrupt tree, and there are fruits of righteousness in the new nature; but the fruits of contrition belong, strictly speaking, to neither of these.

6. What is the specific relation of repentance to the law?

As faith honours the Gospel, so repentance honours the law. (1) In contrition, it mourns over its alienation from the holy commandment, and over personal vileness as revealed in its light; (2) in confession, it acknowledges the justice of the sentence; (3) in amendment, it strives to make reparation.

7. What does this reparation include?

The strictest endeavours to keep the commandment, to renounce all sin, before God; and, before man, confession of faults and reparation for every offence.

8. Where in the Gospels have we the full doctrine of repentance?

Luke iii. 8. In the preaching and ministry of John the Baptist.

9. In what sense is repentance the effect of grace?

It is the result of prevenient grace: (1) applying the law, whether preached or read, to the conscience; (2) blessing the thoughtful consideration induced by affliction or calamity; (3) strengthening the endeavour to turn from sin.

10. Where is the state of conviction fully described?

In the seventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans, where St. Paul describes his former experience as having been brought to the knowledge of sin; his state of inward distress; and his unavailing efforts to keep the perfect commandment: the three elements of repentance in its relation to the law of God.

11. But does not the same apostle, in Galatians v., describe the same conflict as existing in the regenerate?

Not the same conflict: it is between *the flesh* and *the*

Spirit in the Galatians, but between *my flesh* and *my mind* in the Romans. Moreover, in the former he describes the flesh as crucified, Christian men, *led by the Spirit*, as not fulfilling its lusts. It is quite otherwise in the latter, where the convinced sinner is a *wretched man* and still *sold under sin*.

Gal. v. 17. Rom. vii. 18, 23. Gal. v. 18. Rom. vii. 14, 24.

§ 6. Faith as the Instrument of Salvation.

1. What is the faith which brings salvation?

It is that act or habit of the penitent by which, under the influence of the Divine grace, he puts his trust in Christ as the only and the sufficient Saviour.

2. Does not this definition give a limited view of faith?

As a condition of salvation it must be thus limited: it is an exercise of a common faculty directed to special objects; the act of the penitent only; as specially aided by the Spirit; as resting on Christ; and as including trust in Him.

3. Is there a more general view of faith given in Scripture?

Yes: in each of these five respects a wider faith may be noted, out of which the saving faith springs.

4. Explain this more fully as to the first.

Faith is a primary faculty of human nature, which apprehends and believes in and trusts the invisible: all men to a certain extent walk by faith and not by sight alone. But saving faith is that faculty directed to the entire compass of the revelation of saving truth.

5. How is it the act of the penitent only?

There is a mere intellectual belief or credence of which the truths of revelation are the object: their external and internal credentials may win men's assent without attracting their hearts. This faith every intelligent being shall sooner or later possess. But the supernatural order has in it a Gospel revealed only to the faith of the penitent: it is adapted to repentance as light is to the eye.

6. What is its special relation to Divine grace?

Saving faith is exercised under the influence of that general prevenient grace without which man can do nothing good: that grace here reaching its highest point.

7. But is not faith said to be of the operation of God?

No, faith is said to be *in the working* and operation of the God who raised Christ from the dead: it is nowhere declared
Col. ii. 12. to be wrought in us directly and independently.

8. Is not faith one of the fruits of regeneration, and a gift of the Spirit?

The former is a special grace of the new life, and the latter one of the extraordinary charisms of the Spirit.

9. Does saving faith make Christ its only object?

Christ is certainly the first and nearest object where the Gospel is preached. God is however always and most necessarily the ultimate object of all saving faith: *for he*
Heb. xi. 6. *that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that seek after Him.* But the revelation of Christ is the revelation of God; and thus where God is the object—as in justifying faith—Christ is implied: and, where Christ is the object, God is implied.

10. What measure of knowledge must precede this faith?

Belief cometh of hearing: it is therefore not a vague trust in the mere name of Jesus. But, as the sole condition of our being saved, faith requires no more than a
Rom. x. 17. knowledge of Christ as the appointed mediator between God and men.

11. Why is the trust of faith made so emphatic?

Because, first, it is the person of a living God and Saviour that is behind all nearer objects of faith; and, secondly, it is the simple trust of the heart that distinguishes saving faith from all other belief.

12. Does the idea of trust inhere in every description of saving faith?

That it does so may be seen by examination. The word πιστεύειν is used in certain varieties of phraseology: (1)

followed by the dative, it means belief of the words of God or of His Son, and this is reliance on Divine authority; (2) followed by ἐπί or εἰς, it strongly marks repose on a sure foundation; (3) indirectly connected with ἐν it expresses the trust which is really one with its object. Take these in their order: *Abraham believed God. He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life. Ye are all sons of God in Jesus Christ, through faith.* Gal. iii. 6. John iii. 36. Gal. iii. 26.

13. How is this seen in the figures used to describe faith?

Seeking refuge in Him, coming to Him, beholding Him, eating His flesh and drinking His blood, following Him: all these current illustrations, which almost cease to be figures, have personal trust at their root.

14. Is not this trust full assurance?

It is an assured trust; but the assurance of having its object does not belong to the essence of faith as a condition of salvation. To trust without this assurance is the strength of faith; to be followed by assurance is its privilege and glory.

15. How does this agree with the definition of Heb. xi. 1?

That definition, which precedes a catalogue of the triumphs of faith, includes, and indeed makes pre-eminent, the assurance that animates the work of faith. Moreover, it is not the specific faith that precedes salvation, but the general principle of faith in God, which is there intended.

§ 7. Repentance and Faith.

1. In what sense does repentance precede faith?

The self-loathing, self-renouncing, and self-despairing penitent alone is capable of saving faith.

2. In what sense does faith precede repentance?

None can thus repent without faith in the testimonies of God's word concerning sin, with its punishment and remedy.

3. How are they, in their unity, related to justification?

The penitent convicted of sin pleads guilty, trusts in the atoning Reconciler, and his faith is reckoned for righteousness.

4. How to regeneration?

The penitent, acknowledging his spiritual death, receives the Son of God as the new life of his soul.

5. How to sanctification?

The penitent, confessing his unholiness before the altar and trusting in the virtue of the sprinkled blood, is purged from his defilement and accepted on the altar of consecration.

6. Are repentance and faith only preparatory to salvation?

They both enter the regenerate life and are perfected in it: repentance as the constant remembrance of past forgiven sin, with zealous use of all the means of self-mortification; and faith as the grace which worketh by love in the pursuit of perfection, always deepening as its range enlarges.

§ 8. Historical.

1. What was the doctrine of the early Church on these subjects of Vocation and Prevenient Grace?

That the purpose of redemption was universal, and its effect the deliverance of mankind from absolute slavery to sin: this was brought into strong prominence in opposition to the Manichæan notion that its connection with matter determined the soul to evil.

2. Was there any difference in the tendencies of Eastern and Western theology?

The Eastern Church from the beginning exaggerated the function of human will in salvation. The Western dwelt more upon the influence of Divine grace upon the sinner using his will. The former developed into Pelagianism; the latter into Augustinianism, or what in modern times is termed, from John Calvin, its second founder, Calvinism.

3. What did Pelagius teach?

That every man has the same capacity for good in which Adam was created: this being exposed to evil example on the one hand, and led astray; or stimulated by the teaching and better example of Christ on the other, and thus corrected.

4. What was Augustine's teaching in opposition?

That all whom Christ redeemed are actually saved; that irresistible, efficacious grace is given to them at the set time; and that a special gift of perseverance ensures the perpetuity of the state of grace. This last was necessary in Augustine's scheme, because of his doctrine of a sacramental grace in baptism which might be lost. His successor, Calvin, was not embarrassed by any views of a universal sacramental grace.

5. What was the compromise of semi-Pelagianism?

The doctrine that grace is given to all men to counteract the effect of the fall; that every man has strength in himself to turn to God, though subsequent stages of the religious life require direct grace.

6. What form did this assume in the mediæval Church?

There was much controversy in the sixth and ninth centuries; but both synodical decisions and common opinion inclined towards semi-Pelagianism. There was a very general agreement that the foreknowledge of faith or disobedience lies at the root of the revealed doctrine of election. The dogma of prevenient grace settled at the Council of Trent lays much stress on a certain "merit of congruity" in the sinner's co-operation with Divine grace.

7. How was it modified in Lutheranism?

By the theory called Synergism, which rightly taught that man co-operates with Divine grace from the beginning of his salvation; but did not with sufficient distinctness trace this power to the special grace of the Spirit restored in redemption. Some in later times made it too dependent on the grace of baptism. And others have supposed that the prevenient grace of the Spirit goes with the spirits into their prison; and that it is awakened by preaching in Hades.

8. How did Calvin mould Augustine's doctrine?

(1) He laid his foundations deeply in the absolute sovereignty of God. (2) The internal call of the Gospel is, he asserted, as to the non-elect a "sign" only, or the expression of "common grace," to be distinguished from the "sealing

will" of "grace effectual" for the elect. (3) He deprecated the suppression or disguising of the dogma of reprobation.

9. Has Calvinism undergone any modifications?

Its leading standards—of which the Westminster Confession is the English representative—are unchanged. But Amyraldus in France, and Baxter in England, and others elsewhere, omitted reprobation from the system, or changed it into the mere withholding of irresistible grace from the non-elect. Again, inasmuch as the Divine decrees are secret, predestinarian preachers have felt bound to offer the Gospel to all men, and some of them have been among the most catholic and effective evangelists.

10. What was the Arminian form of the doctrine?

The semi-Pelagian mean between Pelagianism and Augustinianism; but with its own special emphasis on the gift of the Spirit as preserving human nature from total ruin.

11. What marks the best Methodist teaching here?

It still more than Arminianism develops the doctrine of prevenient grace: asserting that man is not to be found in the fallen state of nature simply, but that the very nature itself is grace; that the Spirit works through the word with His own preliminary influences, deepening and bringing them to perfection; and that this continuous prevenient grace is in salvation consummated by the gift of regenerate life.

12. What evil does this avoid?

That of counting mankind, with Augustine, a "mass of perdition"; of holding the signs of preparatory life in the convinced sinner to be only "splendid vices"; and of destroying the identity between the converted sinner and the regenerate man in Christ.

13. Does not the opposed system ascribe too much to the human will?

(1) It adopts strictly the language and tone of the New Testament; and leaves the unfathomable mystery with God.

(2) It simply agrees with every sound theory of religion

or philosophy in making the will necessarily free, but swayed by the character of the man who uses it.

(3) It asserts that the sinner has grace given to him which he must reject if he turns not to God.

14. What principles are here unquestionably to be held fast at all costs?

(1) That God is righteous, and will finally approve His righteousness, in all His dealings with His creatures.

(2) That whom He redeemed He will certainly call.

(3) That the methods of His calling are unsearchable.

(4) That He calls none to obey without giving them grace sufficient, if rightly used, to enable them to obey.

(5) That it is a hopeless if not irreverent task to attempt a reconciliation between the undoubted sovereignty of grace and the equally undoubted freedom and responsibility of man.

CHAPTER IV.

The Estate of Grace, or Personal Salvation.

§ 1. Its Diversity in Unity.

1. What is the meaning of this phrase?

It imports the Christian state of full privilege: as distinguished (1) from the grace of preparation on one side, and (2) from the ethics of the religious life on the other.

2. Is it not the middle term between the state of nature and the state of glory?

It is so: always remembering, however, that the state of nature is itself more or less a state of grace.

3. How is this state described in the New Testament?

Rom. v. 2. Jude 3. 1 Cor xiii. 14. 2 Cor. v. 17.

As *The grace wherein we stand*, or *Our common salvation*, or *The communion of the Holy Spirit*, or our being *In Christ.*

4. Are there no other terms or phrases that describe it?

Rom. v. 11. 1 John v. 12. Rom. viii. 23.

Less directly, and in more special relations, it is said to be *Receiving the reconciliation*, or *Having the life*, or possessing *The firstfruits of the Spirit.*

5. What is specially meant by the state of grace?

St. Paul says that *by faith we have had our access into this grace wherein we stand:* all the words are emphatic, and teach that grace is a sphere or state into which penitent believers are admitted, which they occupy together, and in which they prepare for glory. Grace was given outside, or we could not have entered; but *grace reigns* within. Hence it is said that we are *not under law, but under grace.* The grace that brought

Rom. v. 2.

Rom. v. 21. Rom. vi. 14.

Christ to us and us to Christ here puts on its perfection and imparts its highest gifts.

6. What is the leading idea in the word Grace?

The unmerited favour of God resting on the soul: this will satisfy nearly all the passages in which χάρις occurs. Occasionally, however, that favour becomes, as it were, an internal principle. The same word is used for thanks returned to God.

7. What is meant here by unity and diversity?

(1) The estate of grace or personal salvation may be viewed under several aspects: in relation to the law of God, it is the recovery of righteousness; as it respects the soul's death in sin, it is the renewal of life in Christ Jesus, or sonship; in regard to our fellowship with God, it is sanctification.

(2) But these are not blessings following one another: they are all one as an application of the virtue of the atonement by the Spirit, and one as flowing from union with Christ.

8. How are these three one in the atonement?

They are procured by the virtue of the death of Christ toward God. That virtue toward man is imparted by the Holy Spirit in three lines: as the atonement has satisfied the claims of law, its benefit is our pardon and righteousness; as it has abolished death and removed the veil between God and man in the reconciliation, its benefit is our new regenerate life; as it is the sacrifice of expiation, its benefit is our sanctification unto holiness. But these are one and the same blessing.

9. How are they one in our union with Christ?

(1) We are to *become the righteousness of God in Him;* and are accepted through *His grace, which He freely bestowed on us in the Beloved.* (2) *If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature;* and (3) we are *sanctified in Christ Jesus.*

2 Cor. v. 21. Eph. i. 6. 2 Cor. v. 7. 1 Cor. i. 2.

10. Does all this mean that these blessings are given for Christ's sake?

"For Christ's sake" is in Scripture simply "in Christ:" *As God also in Christ forgave you.* Both ideas are sacred; but that of union with Christ implies that the believer is really one with Christ in the virtue of His

Eph. iv. 32.

atoning death to sin and in the virtue of His life-giving Spirit. This is the deepest earthly mystery of grace.

11. Is there then no consecutive order in the communication of these blessings?

They are all given together; or rather are the same common salvation viewed under three aspects.

(1) We may begin with righteousness: the sentence of condemnation is taken away from the penitent, who is then adopted and regenerated and then consecrated to God.

(2) We may begin with sonship: the new life given in Christ is released from the sentence in the court and placed on the altar in the temple. This is essentially the same.

(3) We may begin with sanctification: the defiled sinner sprinkled from the conscience of sin in the temple is blessed with a new life in Christ, and his sins are remembered no more. This third combination harmonises with the preceding.

12. But is there no difference between inward and outward salvation?

The righteousness and sonship and sanctification are all three both inward and outward: no one of them is different from the others in this respect.

13. Is not justification wrought for us and sanctification wrought in us?

This popular distinction is hardly scriptural: there is an internal as well as an external righteousness; and there is both an external and an internal sanctification.

14. But is not sanctification the continuance and progress of regeneration?

Not any more than it is the progress of justification. The three terms belong to totally distinct departments of thought: regeneration means new life, sanctification the giving this to God, and righteousness its harmony with the Divine law.

15. What terms are used to distinguish the outward and inward blessings of the Christian estate?

(1) We speak of righteousness as imputed and imparted. Sometimes the distinction is between forensic (pronounced in a court) and moral, or inwrought.

(2) It is more appropriate to speak of sonship as declaratory adoption and as inwrought regeneration.

(3) And of sanctification as external consecration. as on an altar, and internal purification.

16. Does this threefold distinction regulate the phraseology of Scripture?

Yes, down to very minute shades: there are three classes of terms into which may be distributed all the descriptions of the Christian estate. They are terms of the lawcourt, of the household of God, and of the temple, respectively.

17. Illustrate the unity in diversity of these terms.

(1) As the Christian estate is before the law, God is the Judge, Christ is the Advocate and Surety, sin is transgression, the atonement is a satisfaction, repentance is conviction, acceptance is pardon or remission, renewal is righteousness, the Spirit's witness is of pardon, and the Christian life is obedience: its perfection being the fulfilment of the ordinance of the law.

(2) As it is a new life in Christ, God is the Father, Christ is the Elder Brother and the Life, sin is selfwill and rebellion, the atonement is reconciliation, the penitent is a prodigal, acceptance is adoption, renewal is regeneration, the Spirit's witness is that of adoption, the Christian life is the mortification of the old man and the raising up of the new: its perfection being the perfect reflection of the image of Christ the Onlybegotten.

(3) As it is life dedicated in the temple, God is God only, Christ is the High Priest, sin is defilement, the atonement is an expiatory sacrifice, repentance is consciousness of being unclean, the soul is accepted on the altar, the Spirit's witness is the silent seal of His possession, the Christian life is holiness: its perfection being entire sanctification from sin and to God.

18. Is there not a progression from justification through regeneration to entire sanctification?

These three blessings must begin together; and each has its own sure progress towards its own perfection.

19. Are all the terms in each class kept quite distinct?

Usually they are; but a few, such as faith and love, belong to the phraseology of all departments alike.

I.

Christian Righteousness.

§ 1. Preliminary.

1. What are the leading terms in this subject?

(1) Those which belong to the family of δίκη or right, each of which will be found to occupy its place in the doctrine.

(2) All those which use the language of judicial procedure: almost every forensic term employed in human lawcourts is introduced with its evangelical meaning.

(3) Many also which more indirectly keep in view the idea of religion as obedience to law, and as the attainment of a character in harmony with right.

2. Is not Christianity made, here at the outset, too legal?

The Saviour came not *to destroy the law;* He bids us to seek first the kingdom of God and *His righteousness.* And St. Paul says that in the Gospel *we establish law.* The substance of Christianity is *the perfect law, the law of liberty.*

Matt. v. 17; vi. 33. Rom. iii. 31. Jas. i. 25.

3. Does not the Gospel, having delivered us from the sentence of the law, train us to a perfection independent of law?

No: for the whole business of religion, from beginning to end, is transacted in the mediatorial court; *that the requirement* (or *righteousness*) *of the law might be fulfilled in us.* Christianity makes its children *bondservants unto righteousness:* though the service is perfect freedom.

Rom. viii. 4. Rom. vi. 18.

§ 2. Righteousness.

1. What is the meaning of righteousness in Scripture?

The state or character which is conformed to the standard of the Divine law. That is δικαιοσύνη, and he who has satisfied or is satisfying the law is δίκαιος, righteous.

2. Can fallen man thus satisfy the law?

He cannot satisfy it save by suffering its penalty. He is by nature both condemned and without strength: *under the law.*

Rom. vi. 14.

3. How is the phrase "righteousness of God" used in the New Testament?

To signify that new and special righteousness which in the gospel God provides and accepts. This righteousness of God is called the righteousness of Christ and the righteousness of faith as opposed to man's OWN righteousness and to that of *the law* or of *works*. Rom. x. 3. Phil. iii. 9.

4. In what sense is it a special righteousness?

Because it has been specially provided to meet the case of sinners by the Lawgiver Himself.

5. How does it meet their case?

Through the virtue of Christ's atoning satisfaction, righteousness is imputed to them as they are outwardly condemned, and imparted to them as they are inwardly unrighteous.

6. Is it then Christ's righteousness as well as the righteousness of God?

The phrase "righteousness of Christ" is never used; nor is that said to be imputed. But He is *made unto us righteousness*, and we *are made the righteousness of God in Him*. 1 Cor. i. 30. 2 Cor. v. 21.

7. Is there here any real difference?

It may seem hard to deny that Christ's righteousness is put to the believer's account; but the true doctrine of imputation shows why the Scripture does not say that it is.

8. What is the true doctrine of imputation?

Imputation is the reckoning to a man his own act with its consequences: as when sin is imputed to every living soul. But imputation, in its evangelical meaning, is also the reckoning to any one the consequences of another's act: as the consequences of Adam's sin are reckoned to his descendants; the consequences of man's sin were reckoned to Christ; and the consequences of Christ's obedience are reckoned to the believer.

9. How then is Christ's righteousness reckoned to man?

First, it is put to the account of all the world in that God is reconciled to the human race and condemns none for the

original sin. Secondly, and chiefly, it is put to the believer's account in his being reckoned and dealt with as a righteous person in Christ or for His sake.

10. What is that righteousness of Christ which is reckoned to us in its benefit?

His one great obedience, active and passive,—these being essentially one,—whereby He is *the Lord our righteousness.*

Jer. xxiii. 16.

11. Is the personal righteousness of Christ Himself reckoned to the believer as his own?

Assuredly not; any more than the personal sin of the sinner was reckoned to be Christ's. Moreover, as the Divine Son of God could not have our individual sins imputed to Him, so His Divine-human obedience was altogether beyond the range of man's obedience to the law. There could not be any such personal transfer.

12. What is the meaning of the phrase "righteousness of faith"?

As the "righteousness of God" describes the evangelical method in its origin, and the "righteousness of Christ" describes it in its grounds, so the "righteousness of faith" describes it in its instrumentality on the part of man. Faith receives it as external, and works through love an internal righteousness: thus it is always OF FAITH.

13. Then the righteousness of faith includes the internal righteousness?

Yes: it is the Divine method of placing man at all points and for ever in his right relation to the eternal law.

14. In what sense was this called a new method?

Its grounds and nature are fully revealed only in the Gospel; but this righteousness alone has been valid and sufficient in all ages. Through the mediation of Jesus not yet manifested God has been Just and the Justifier of all from the beginning who put their trust in Him. St. Paul says that this method, *apart from law*, is yet *witnessed by the law and the prophets:* that is, by all Scripture. Faith in the Redeemer, revealed or unrevealed, has been the principle of acceptance from the first.

Rom. iii. 21.

15. What particular proof of this does St. Paul give?

His chief illustration is Abraham : *to Abraham his faith was reckoned for righteousness ;* who *received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while in circumcision : that he might be the father of all them that believe.* St. James uses the same illustration. Rom. iv. 9, 11. Jas. ii. 23.

16. Was not the righteousness of faith before Abraham?

From the beginning faith was the condition of acceptance and the strength of all obedience. Noah *became heir of the righteousness which is according to faith.* Heb. xi. 7.

17. What was in early times the specific object of this faith?

The general promise of Christ the Deliverer. Abraham's faith had reference to the Seed of whom Isaac was the type : it was not faith in God generally, but faith towards God as revealing the promise of Christ. A certain prophecy of a coming Saviour began the history of fallen mankind.

18. How does St. Paul sum up all this?

In the epistle to the Romans chiefly, which is much occupied with the judicial aspect of the Gospel ; and especially in the sentence at the outset which lays down its general subject.

19. Give an analysis of that verse.

It speaks (1) of *the righteousness of God ;* as (2) revealed *in the gospel* as a righteousness through Christ ; and (3) as a righteousness only to believers, whether Jew or Greek : being a righteousness originating as to God from faith, and as to man operating *by faith unto faith ;* attested by the prophet's word, *But the righteous shall live by faith ;* and finally a revelation not only of mercy but of *the power of God unto salvation,* unto righteousness internal and external. Rom. i. 16, 17, 19.

20. Is this epistle occupied only with righteousness?

That is its leading theme ; but as it proceeds it connects Christian righteousness both with Christian sonship and with Christian sanctification.

§ 3. Justification by Faith: Imputed Righteousness.

1. In what way is the relation of righteousness to faith expressed?

We read of (1) righteousness *through faith* (διά); (2) righteousness *from faith* (ἐκ); (3) righteousness *of faith* (the genitive); (4) righteousness *according to faith* (κατά); (5) righteousness of God *on faith* (ἐπί). Never, of course, "on account of" (διά with the accusative): as if faith were the ground.

Rom. iii. 22. Rom. ix. 30. Rom. iv. 11. Heb. xi. 7. Phil. iii. 9.

2. These indicate faith as the instrument generally; but what is the more precise relation of faith to righteousness?

It is exhibited in two ways. (1) Faith is reckoned for righteousness: *to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness.* The ungodly who believes is treated as if he were not ungodly: his faith is the only obedience he can render, and it stands in the stead of all other righteousness at the moment of his acceptance. (2) Righteousness, however, is not reckoned to the faith, but to the man who believes: *Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness.* This latter way of stating the same truth guards the former.

Rom. iv. 5. Rom. iv. 3.

3. What terms are used for the application of this blessing?

(1) God is said to justify; that is, to pronounce or declare righteous, δικαιοῦν. *It is God that justifieth, who is he that shall condemn?* Here this δικαιῶν is the exact opposite of κατακρίνων, as it usually is throughout Scripture. (2) God pronounces a sentence of justification, δικαίωσις. *Who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification,* διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν: not that Christ was raised to justify us; but His resurrection declared that His death was the valid meritorious ground justifying or warranting the act of our justification. (3) God is said to pardon the sinner or remit his penalty or not impute his sin: these meaning the same. *Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin.*

Rom. viii. 33. Rom. iv. 25. Rom. iv. 7, 8.

4. State clearly the distinction between pardon, remission, and justification.

(1) Pardon rests upon the sinner, and is expressed as the free bestowment of grace : ἐχαρίσατο, *He frankly forgave. Grace, which He freely bestowed on us in the Beloved.* (2) Remission refers to the guilt or debt or penalty of sin not exacted : ἀφιέναι, and ἄφεσις, the most frequent of all. (3) Justification is the regarding that forgiven person, whose debt is remitted, as being also in the position of a righteous person. This is the strict meaning of an imputation of righteousness. Luke vii. 42. Eph. i. 6.

5. Who is the dispenser of justification?

It is God that justifieth as the Judge in the mediatorial court. Our Lord forgave sins ; but when the economy of mediation is fully revealed it is IN HIM *every one that believeth is justified*, not "by Him ;" *God also* IN CHRIST *forgave us*, which has been translated and read as "for Christ's sake." Rom. viii. 34 Acts xiii. 39. Eph iv. 32.

6. What is the specific object on which justifying faith rests?

(1) Formally stated, and according to the theory of the covenant of grace, it rests *on Him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification :* the Father accepts His Son's sacrifice for us, proves this by His Son's resurrection, and as the just consequence exercises the judicial act of δικαίωσις. (2) But habitually the object is *Jesus Christ* Himself ; and once it is God *that justifieth the ungodly*, this "strange act" being His glory in redemption, and the prerogative of the mediatorial court : its most ancient and sacred tradition. Rom. iii. 22 ; iv. 5.

7. Is not the blood of Christ the object of this faith?

St. Paul speaks of our *being now justified by*, or *in, His blood* as the great first deliverance, which is ground of confidence that we shall be saved from future wrath. "Faith in His blood" is a phrase that does not certainly occur ; we should rather read : *Whom God set forth a propitiation in His blood, through faith, to shew His righteousness.* Our reliance is on the blood of Christ, but still more directly on Himself : faith passes by every other object and seeks only the Lord. Rom. v. 9. Rom. iii. 25.

§ 4. Justification by Faith: Imparted Righteousness.

1. What is the relation between imputed and imparted righteousness?

(1) They are to be carefully distinguished: the former looks at the present and past, imputing righteousness in the sense of not imputing sin; the latter looks at the present and future, making provision for new obedience. (2) They must never be separated: imputation would dishonour law if it was not bound up with security for future righteousness; and imparted righteousness must always be accompanied by imputed in the case of every forgiven sinner.

2. More explicitly state this last view of the relation.

It may be said that the imputation of righteousness or non-imputation of sin must take the lead; a man is pardoned before he goes to sin no more. It may also be said that, when he is made perfectly righteous, and throughout eternity, his past sin will still remain as a fact not imputed: there will be for ever a non-imputation to him of his guilt.

3. What is the strict meaning of imparted righteousness?

It is given in the terms of the new covenant: *I will put My laws into their mind, and on their heart also I will write them.* Again, the new nature *hath been created in righteousness.*

Heb. vii. 10.
Eph. iv. 24.

4. Does not this connect righteousness with regeneration?

Yes: it has already been seen that it is the regenerate soul which is both made righteous and made holy. The living Christian is brought into harmony with the law of God: that is his righteousness. He is brought into fellowship with the holiness of God: that is his sanctification.

5. What terms are used for the pursuit of this righteousness?

It is called obedience in principle: *And hereby we know that we know Him, if we keep His commandments.* The sum and strength of this obedience is love: *Love therefore is the fulfilment of law.* And the result is practical righteousness: *He that doeth righteousness is righteous.*

1 John ii. 3.
Rom. xiii. 10.
1 John iii. 7.

6. But is not this anticipating Christian ethics?

Yes, in some measure: doctrine and morality go together. This righteousness, however, is really imparted by the Spirit, and imparted to faith: hence it is as much a branch of the righteousness of faith as imputed righteousness is.

7. How is this seen?

(1) Faith embraces the promise of the virtue of the blood of Jesus *to cleanse us from all unrighteousness;* and (2) *faith working through love* is reckoned for a perfect fulfilment of all law. Together these passages show that the internal righteousness is given or administered by the Spirit to faith. 1 John i. 9. Gal. v. 6.

8. What is the extent of attainment permitted to the hope and desire of faith?

That the righteousness (or *requirement*) *of the law might be fulfilled in us.* The standard is *even as He is righteous.* These classical passages also shew that the righteousness of the inner man is a gift that must come from above. Rom. viii. 3. 1 John iii. 7.

§ 5. Faith and Works.

1. How is the relation of faith and works exhibited?

(1) Faith is opposed to works as meritorious, and the formula is: *A man is not justified by works of law, but only through faith in Jesus Christ.* Gal. iii. 16.

(2) Faith lives only in its works, and the formula is: *Faith without works is dead.* Jas. ii. 26.

(3) Faith is justified and approved by works, and the formula is: *I will shew thee my faith by my works.* Jas. ii. 8.

(4) Faith is perfected in works, and the formula is: *By works was faith made perfect.* Jas. ii. 22.

2. How may this be otherwise stated?

The texts given above justify us in saying that works are (1) the result of faith, (2) the test of faith, (3) the consummation of faith.

3. What works are excluded from justification and in what sense?

(1) All that flows from the sinner and is his *own* Phil. iii. 9

righteousness must be below the requirement of the law, and therefore be rejected as a ground of justification.

(2) Any righteousness *of the law*, of any law whatever, must be insufficient ground of justification, on account of past transgression which law never forgets.

Phil. iii. 9.

4. What works are necessary for justification and in what sense are they necessary?

(1) All those which spring from Christ and *the power of His resurrection*, or the virtue of His life within the believer.

Phil. iii. 10.

(2) All those that show the special kind of obedience which is the condition of present and future and final acceptance.

Heb. v. 9.

5. What then do we mean in saying that justification is by faith only?

That (1) faith excludes the righteousness of our own works; (2) it simply appropriates the righteousness provided in Christ; and (3) it is the strength of all subsequent obedience to law or internal righteousness.

6. How do works show the life of faith?

In two ways: (1) living faith is the faith of a living or regenerate soul and *worketh through love;* (2) living faith unites with Christ and must produce the fruits which declare His indwelling. *He that abideth in Me and I in him, the same beareth much fruit.*

Gal. v. 6.
John xv. 5.

7. Does not this discountenance the thought of a distinct imputation of Christ's active righteousness?

Most certainly. Before union with Him we must think of no other obedience than His; afterwards by His Spirit He fulfils the law in us who fulfilled it once for all for us.

8. How is all this illustrated in Abraham the Father and Pattern of believers?

By St. Paul and St. James respectively, and independently of each other. (1) Both represent the justification of Abraham as a declaration or reckoning of righteousness, quoting the same phrase, ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην: St. James indeed quoting it more fully. (2) St. Paul refers to

Rom. iv. 22.
Jas. ii. 23.

the time when Abraham's faith was only *looking unto the promise of God;* St. James's to a time when *faith wrought with his works.* (3) St. James gives the solution: *By works was faith made perfect*, ἐτελειώθη. The principle of faith in Gen. xv. was developed into its issues in Gen. xxii. But it was the same faith and the same righteousness of faith.

Rom. iv. 20. Gen. xv. 6. Jas. ii. 22. Gen. xxii. 9.

9. What is the difference between the two apostles as to living faith?

St. Paul makes living faith the soul which quickens works otherwise dead; St. James makes works the soul which quickens faith otherwise dead. But a close examination shows that they mean the same thing.

10. How does St. John harmonise the two views?

By this warning: *Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous.* 1 John iii. 7.

§ 6. Historical.

1. What was the general teaching of the early Fathers as to the righteousness of faith?

(1) They were faithful to apostolical doctrine and phrase: laying more stress, however, on the internal righteousness than on the righteousness imputed.

(2) Gradually, in the third and fourth centuries, germs of error began to appear: such as the satisfaction of good works being held necessary for the forgiveness of sins committed after baptism; and a higher righteousness to be found in keeping the counsels of perfection.

2. Sum up the tendencies of mediæval error.

They may be expressed in few words. The legal element in Christianity was exaggerated:

(1) Justification was made to be the issue of a series of preparations which, not having any merit properly so called (meritum e condigno), yet deserve acceptance by way of congruity (meritum e congruo). This disturbed the simplicity of the Gospel, and laid a snare in the way of the penitent.

(2) Justification when bestowed was regarded as the making righteous by the infusion of inherent grace. Thus faith, hope and charity, the three theological graces, were themselves regarded as righteousness.

(3) Faith therefore was the instrument of justification, not as appropriating the promise in Christ, but as being the germ of all good: "informed with charity."

(4) Justification as imputed righteousness was entirely undervalued, if not lost, in the dogma of a justification which ONLY "makes righteous" and imparts righteousness gradually.

3. Were there no protests against these tendencies?

Yes: there were never wanting voices that warned against the idea of merit in good works, and denied the Church's fund for indulgences, and mourned over the dishonour thus done to the GRACE of the Gospel.

4. Were these protests effectual?

Not until the Reformation of the sixteenth century—Protestantism proper—which originated in the vindication of the doctrine of justification by grace or the righteousness of faith against the traditions of Rome.

5. What were the characteristics of this vindication?

(1) Justification by faith was declared to be mainly the being "absolved from sins," by a sentence strictly forensic, for the sake of Christ's righteousness apprehended by faith.

(2) Good works were inculcated as the fruits of faith, but carefully denied any place in the dogma of justification.

(3) This one truth, recovered from perversion, was naturally exaggerated for a time, and too much limited to the forensic view. Justification was ONLY imputed righteousness.

6. Wherein did the Reformed or Calvinist doctrine differ from the Lutheran or Evangelical?

Both laying stress upon the imputation of Christ's righteousness, the Calvinist teachers held that it was transferred in all respects to those who were elected in Christ: an eternal

justification only applied in time, and never to be lost. Hence the Calvinist teaching regards justification as no other than the pronouncing a believer for ever freed from the OBLIGATION of obedience as such.

7. What error then must be guarded against in respect to the imputation of Christ's righteousness?

(1) That of making His entire righteousness wholly substitutionary (ἀντί) instead of partly beneficial (ὑπέρ): it is neither alone; but includes both, the one idea always accompanying and qualifying the other.

(2) That of dividing it into two parts: the passive, reckoned to the believer as his own satisfaction to penal justice; and the active, reckoned to the believer as his own satisfaction of the moral requirement. This distinction violates the eternal principles of God's government; no creature can ever be discharged from obedience.

(3) Consequently, as has been seen in the doctrine of the atonement, it is wrong to speak of Christ's righteousness as directly imputed. It is rather to be regarded as the all-sufficient ground of God's mercy to the whole world and to every man.

8. But was not Christ's righteousness substitutionary, seeing that as the Godman He was bound to no obedience for Himself?

It is certainly true that the Incarnate Son of God was not obedient for Himself: He was always, in life and in death, a Divine Person. But that very fact shows that His righteousness could not be strictly vicarious: the Godman could not take the very place of man either in suffering or in obedience.

9. What new views did Arminianism introduce?

It mediated between the Mediæval and the Protestant teaching: asserting that the faith which is reckoned for righteousness is a faith including obedience, though having no merit; and that God accepts the imperfect righteousness of faith as perfect for Christ's sake. Accordingly, the law was held to have been in some sense relaxed as to its requirements.

10. What error is there here?

It is better to say that for Christ's sake, and in Christ, God accepts the believer and pardons the imperfection of his righteousness always until by grace his conformity to law is made inwardly complete, which it certainly must be.

11. How does our Lord's suretyship affect this?

He is the general Mediator of the covenant (μεσίτης); but He is the special Surety (ἔγγυος) or sponsor that its provisions shall be carried out in the interest, so to speak, of both parties. For God He pledges forgiveness as to the past; for man He pledges a perfect tribute to the righteousness of the law in the future. The latter is too often forgotten.

12. What difference was there between the Arminian and the Tridentine doctrines of a gradual righteousness?

(1) Both held rightly that justification is a state of man as well as an act of God; and that believers are made more and more righteous in increasing conformity with law.

(2) But the Arminians held that the imputation of righteousness must always come first, as faith embraces Christ for pardon; while the Romanists taught that justification is from the beginning the making righteous.

13. How are Antinomianism and Supererogation related to this subject?

(1) Antinomianism as a doctrine makes Christ the end of the law. For its penalty and its demands He has made Himself responsible. There may be reasons for obedience in the filial relation, but none in the law as a condition of life.

(2) Supererogatory works make Christ the end of the law in another sense. While they exaggerate the importance of nce as the condition of life, they dishonour law by dividinto obligatory commandments and optional counsels.

14. What was the Socinian or Unitarian teaching?

Rejecting the divinity and atonement of Christ it regarded the term imputation as meaning merely God's merciful estimate of good desires and good works as all the righteousness He

requires. He imputes in mercy to man what man has not: repentance and honest endeavour being enough.

15. What expedients have been adopted by mystical theology to soften the idea of imputation?

It regarded the Indwelling Christ as the formal cause of justification: His righteousness being at once reckoned to the believer as his own and flowing into the believer's life. The being reckoned righteous is however almost lost in the having righteousness.

16. How may this be set aside?

By saying that what truth it has is only a variation or disguise of the twofold principle of the righteousness of faith: Christ FOR us and Christ IN us.

17. What is the best defence of imputation?

(1) The constant assertion that there must needs be imputation of righteousness and non-imputation of sin for ever: the eternal law can never forget the past; (2) that the notion of an imputed righteousness is never to be separated, either in doctrine or practice, from that of a righteousness imparted; (3) that justification is more than pardon, being an imputation of righteousness for Christ's sake which anticipates the future and perfect reality of the righteousness which it imputes.

II.

Christian Sonship.

§ 1. Preliminary.

1. What is the full meaning of this expression?

It means the Christian estate of grace as restoration to life in God and the filial relation to Him as a Father.

2. How is it connected with righteousness and sanctification?

The relation may be stated in two ways. (1) The personality of the sinner being the same always, he must first

have the sentence cancelled in justification before he can become an adopted child of God and be consecrated to His service. But (2) it is the new nature given him in regeneration that renders him capable of being made righteous and inwardly pure. (3) Thus the former refers to external privilege; and the order is justification, adoption, consecration. The latter refers to internal possession; and the order is regeneration, righteousness, and sanctification. But strictly speaking, these three are one blessing of the new covenant under three aspects.

3. What is included in the vocabulary of the estate of sonship?

All the terms that introduce life as in Christ; as also those which define the means of its impartation, the privileges which it confers, its struggle with the old nature, its perfection as the restoration of the Divine image.

4. What then are the two branches of our present subject?

Adoption as external and declaratory; regeneration as inwrought in the soul.

§ 2. Adoption and Regeneration.

1. State the unity and the difference of these terms.

They are one as the Christian sonship; regeneration being its internal reality and adoption its external privilege.

2. Is the distinction carefully maintained in the New Testament?

No: for the common sonship is defined sometimes by the word sons (*υἱοί*), which lies at the root of adoption; and sometimes by the word children (*τέκνα*), which implies regeneration.

3. Where is it then to be observed?

St. Paul alone combines the two ideas: *Ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God: and if children, then heirs.* Rom. viii. 15, 16. Without the term adoption, we find the distinction in St. John:

To them gave He the RIGHT *to become children of God, . . . which were born* OR BEGOTTEN . . . *of God.* And again: *that we should be* CALLED *children of God: and such* WE ARE. St. Peter speaks of the Father as having *begotten us again* in our regeneration *to an inheritance*, which is the privilege of adoption. Our Lord gave the two thoughts when He said, speaking of sonship, *If therefore the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.* This was the future adoption; and when He afterwards added, *If God were your Father, ye would love Me*, He referred to the future regeneration. He had before given an indirect note of the distinction: *Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God.*

John i. 12, 13. 1 John iii. 1. 1 Peter i. 3, 4. John viii. 36, 42. John iii. 3.

4. But does not the Spirit Who imparts the spirit of adoption, shedding abroad a sense of the Father's love in the heart, thereby produce the new life?

St. Paul does not establish this order: he rather inverts it. The spirit of adoption is given to the regenerate. Rom. viii. 15.

5. What is the highest tribute paid to this twofold privilege?

Believers are said to be of God *foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the Firstborn among many brethren;* and *unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto Himself.* We are said to be foreordained only to this fellowship with the Eternal Son and with the Only-Begotten: there is no higher, no other, predestination. Rom. viii. 29. Eph. i. 5.

§ 3. Regeneration.

1. What is the grace of regeneration?

The Divine act which imparts to the penitent believer the new and higher life in personal union with Christ.

2. How is this blessing of the new covenant described?

In a large variety of ways, which require to be classified and studied. The several definitions refer to the Divine act or its effect; particularly, however, as the gift of life in Christ.

3. Who is the Divine Agent in regeneration?

Specially the Holy Spirit: *that which is born of* John iii. 6.

the Spirit is spirit. But each Person of the Trinity, and God generally, is said to be the author of the new life.

Jas. i. 18. Eph. ii. 1. John v. 21.

4. What analogy does this suggest between the incarnation and our regeneration?

The Incarnate Jesus is *the Son of God;* yet *the Word became flesh* and *taketh hold of the seed of Abraham;* while it was said of the mother of our Lord, *That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.* The Three Persons are here also.

Luke i. 35. John i. 14. Heb. ii. 16. Matt. i. 20.

5. In what way is the Divine act most frequently described?

Chiefly by terms expressing the generation of a new life; which is sometimes also regarded as a new creation.

6. How may the terms of generation be classified?

(1) God is *He that begat;* in the regenerate *His seed abideth;* and, in one remarkable passage, we read, *Of His own will He brought us forth*, or *gave us birth* (ἀπεκύησεν).

1 John v. 1. 1 John iii. 9. Jas. i. 18.

(2) Conversely, the believer *has been* or *is begotten of God*, and *is born of the Spirit* (ἐκ emphatically in both) and *born anew* (or, as it may be translated, *from above*).

1 John v. 1. John iii. 8. John iii. 7.

(3) But these passages do not indicate any distinction of time between the begetting and the being born; they give us generally the doctrine of the New Birth.

7. What is the special importance of these testimonies?

They establish the following points:

(1) That, whatever man may do through prevenient grace to prepare himself, the new birth is the act of Divine omnipotence: *Of His own will*, and *by the word of truth.*

Jas. i. 18.

(2) That the new birth, being of God, and making us *partakers of the Divine nature*, is the highest dignity, indeed the only peculiarity, of the Christian covenant.

2 Pet. i. 4.

(3) That it is indispensably necessary, as distinguished from the birth of nature: *Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God;* and of sinful nature: *That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.*

John i. 13. John iii. 6.

(4) That, therefore, it is the necessity of every man. Our

Saviour's first testimonies, and St. John's last, alike lay the stress on the individual. *So is every one that is born of the Spirit*, and *Ye must be born anew:* δεῖ ὑμᾶς, an expression of deep solemnity in every instance of the Redeemer's use of it. John iii. 8, 7. 1 John v. 12.

8. **But none of these passages connect regeneration directly with Christ: how is this life related to Him?**

Everywhere and at all points, as New-Testament revelation advances. Our Lord called Himself *the Life* generally and specifically with reference to the resurrection. Both He and His Apostles, however, connect the life of regeneration with His Person in various ways, as follows: John xiv. 6. John xi. 25.

(1) The new life is begun, nourished, made permanent, and consummated through union with Christ by faith. *I am the Vine, ye are the branches. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. He that hath the Son, hath the life.* The mystical union of the Incarnate Son with his spirit is the consummate life of the believer: *Christ liveth in me*, this being the life of justification also. John xv. 5. John vi. 53. 1 John v. 12. Gal. ii. 20.

(2) The term quickening connects the new life with our Saviour's resurrection, and that in two senses: (1) as our Lord had power to raise Himself from death, He in that power *quickeneth whom He will;* (2) as believers are united generally with Christ, their union is with His death and life: *If we died with Him, we believe that we shall also live with Him;* (3) but in this quickening, the life of regeneration is hardly to be separated in any passage from the life of justification: *And you did He quicken, when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins.* Therefore they are subordinate as definitions. John v. 21. Rom. vi. 8. Eph. ii. 1.

(3) The terms of new creation vary the idea: *If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature.* Christians *are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works.* Thus the individual is created as one member of a new humanity. 2 Cor. v. 17. Eph ii. 13.

(4) The agency of the Holy Spirit is conformed to this truth. He is never said to be the author of the new life save as *in Christ Jesus*, or as revealing Christ within the soul, *the Lord* Who *is the Spirit* and *the life-giving Spirit.* Rom. viii. 1. 2 Cor. iii. 17. 1 Cor. xv. 45.

(5) Lastly, the indwelling of the Son, through the Holy

Spirit, is the indwelling of God ; and this is therefore the greatest word on regeneration, uniting in one all that has been said. *I in them and Thou in Me ;* after which *God abideth in him and he in God :* God in the Son by the Holy Spirit

John xvii. 23. 1 John iv. 15.

9. Are there not other ways of defining regeneration ?

(1) There are many which serve rather to illustrate than to define the new life, or which refer rather to the effects of regeneration than to regeneration itself. Such are the illumination of the soul, the circumcision of Christ, and in a certain sense the new creation. The one and only real definition is the new life in Christ Jesus, or Christ the new life of the spirit : all others lead up to this and demand it.

2 Cor. iv. 6. Col. ii. 11. 2 Cor. v. 17.

(2) There are some which refer rather to the growth of the new nature than to that beginning of it which is regeneration proper. The *inward man is renewed day by day*, into the lost image of God ; *the new man which is being renewed.* Regeneration and Renewal must be thus distinguished.

2 Cor. iv. 16. Col. iii. 10.

10. What is the relation of the inward man to the new man in regeneration ?

(1) The former is man in his spiritual relations as distinguished from his physical. St. Paul once speaks of it as unregenerate : *I delight in the law of God after the inward man.* Again he speaks of the same as renewed gradually or habitually : *strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inward man.* Thus the inward man is the permanent subject.

Rom. vii. 22. Eph. iii. 16.

(2) *The new man* (καινός) is the regenerate nature, as such, once *put on* after putting off the old man ; chiefly, however, as gradually *being renewed* (νέος) *after the image of Him that created him.* The former marks the CHANGE, the latter the NEWNESS.

Eph. iv. 24. Col. iii. 10.

11. What are the relations of regeneration to the order of grace and other privileges ?

These have been already alluded to ; but a few things may be added the importance of which is very great.

(1) As to the Christian life generally, regeneration takes the middle place between the life of release from condemnation and the life everlasting which follows the resurrection.

(2) As to preliminary grace, regeneration is not merely its full development, but a new gift of life in Christ, for which that grace only prepares : the preparation may be mistaken for the gift, inasmuch as it shows many signs of a life of its own.

(3) As to original sin, regeneration brings entire freedom from its power : *For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and death.* Rom. viii. 2.

(4) To justification and sanctification it is related as new life is related to the righteousness and holiness of that life.

(5) It is the substratum of all ethics, which are in this relation viewed as the growth of the new man, or fruits of a new nature, or the gradual renewal into the original image of God lost or defaced through sin.

12. What are the conditions and means of regeneration ?

(1) The preliminary grace of repentance and faith, used under the influence of the Spirit, is the condition.

(2) The efficient cause is the Spirit using the Word of God.

(3) The sacraments are the seals and pledges of the new life : Baptism of its bestowment, and the Eucharist of its continuance and increase. Channels, strictly speaking, they are not.

(4) But the formal cause is the formation of Christ in the soul as the principle and element of its new life.

§ 4. Adoption.

1. What is the theological meaning of this word ?

It is used by St. Paul to express the privileges to which regeneration under the new covenant introduces believers, as they are children of God.

2. Does it not indicate the manner in which they become children ?

The term *υἱοθεσία*, or adoptio, meant in ordinary usage a man's taking into the household children not born of him. But this meaning seems to be lost in that of the filial privilege. Those whom God adopts are really *born of God*, not merely supposed to be ; and in fact our Father in Christ is never said to adopt ; there is no verb "adopt" corresponding to "beget." 1 John v. 1.

3. What are the special privileges of the adoption?

The prerogatives which distinguish those who are children of God through faith in Jesus Christ from the world generally and from the members of the old covenant. These are:

(1) Membership in *the kingdom of God*, which none but the regenerate can *see* or *enter into*. This is the *household of God*. The Israel of the ancient theocracy were elected into it as a nation; and of them St. Paul says *Whose is the adoption*, as Jehovah had said *Israel is My son, even My first-born*. But the election from the world is now individual: *Ye are all*—in the sense of each—*sons of God, through faith in Jesus Christ*. The elect are no other than these.

John iii. 3–5. Eph. ii. 19. Rom. ix. 4. Ex. iv. 22. Gal. iii. 26.

(2) The blessing of filial confidence towards God: *Ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God.* The regenerate has a spirit of adoption that always holds communion with a Father; and the Holy Spirit confirms this ordinarily by His secret witness.

Rom. viii. 15, 16.

(3) Freedom from the bondage of the law. It is the privilege of *the fulness of the time* that the Son was sent forth *that He might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.* The application is wider than to the old economy. There is liberty from the condemnation of any law, and liberty from the bondage of our own impotence. This freedom is deliverance from being *under the law* as written without. Christians are under *the perfect law, the law of liberty*, which is put *on their heart* and written *upon their mind also*. There is no limit to this freedom.

Gal. iv. 4, 5. Gal. v. 18. Jas. i. 25. Heb. x. 16.

(4) The sons of God have a special relation to the Incarnate Son, which is the glory of their estate. As children of His Father *He is not ashamed to call them brethren.* Their regeneration links them with the Only-Begotten; their adoption with the Eternal Son. The privilege is the possession of Christ's Spirit in this life, the pledge and means of deliverance from all sin; and in the life to come the transformation of their bodies *conformed to the body of His glory:* that is, *the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.*

Heb. ii. 11. Phil. iii. 21. Rom. viii. 23.

(5) Their sonship gives them a title to the Inheritance, which is finally and supremely God Himself,—they are *heirs of God*—and subordinately the manifold privileges of the Christian covenant consummated in heaven. 1 Peter i. 4. Rom. viii. 17.

§ 5. Historical.

1. What has been the current of doctrine on this subject?

The teaching of the Christian Church has been generally faithful to one principle: that Christianity has brought a new life to man through Jesus Christ. But as to the nature of that life and the means of its bestowment there have been many wide and persistent differences.

2. Sum up the errors as to its nature.

They have been two chiefly: that which has regarded it as only the improvement of man's own natural estate, and that which has held it to be imparted without regard to any concurrence of human preparation.

3. What was the extreme representative of the former?

Pelagianism, which, denying original sin, made the renewal of human nature a matter of Christian discipline only.

4. And what have been its modifications?

The error may be traced through semi-Pelagianism, which taught that man's power was only weakened through the fall, down to the modern teachers who assert that regeneration is the choice of the human will directed to good, and the right exercise of our own faculties under the influence of grace.

5. Where has the latter error been found?

In Predestinarianism, from Augustine downward, which has maintained that regeneration is the first saving act of the Spirit in the soul of man: an act sovereign; effectual in the fruits of repentance, faith, and holiness; and never to be undone or lost after being truly experienced.

6. Where is the Scriptural medium between these?

Sought darkly in semi-Pelagianism, it was found in the Synergism of Lutheran theology, but still more clearly in the

doctrine of a prevenient grace of the Holy Spirit that prepares for perfect life in Christ Jesus. This life is then given through the same Spirit to the faith which is at once wrought by and rests on *the working of God.*

Col. ii. 12.

7. What less prevalent errors may be mentioned?

(1) The ancient Gnostic heresy, still found in its subtle influence, that the spirit in man was not affected by sin, and that the sensuous soul only is renewed.

(2) The modern theory that regeneration is itself the gift of a spirit through the Spirit: here, as the opposite of the former, the loss of the spirit is held to have been the effect of sin, which virtually reduced man to mere body and soul.

8. How may these be refuted together?

Regeneration is the spirit of new life imparted by the Spirit to the entire personality and nature of man.

9. Is there no other error akin to these?

That of those who suppose the Holy Spirit to give such an ascendency to the renewed spirit that no sin remains in the regenerate, supposed to preserve his union with Christ.

10. How is this condemned?

By the Apostle's testimony that *the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit* (the Holy Spirit in our spirit, or our spirit under the Holy Spirit) [*lusteth*] *against the flesh.*

Gal. v. 17.

11. But does not this answer do away with the difference between the state of conviction or conversion and that of regeneration?

No: in the state of preliminary grace the conflict is between the flesh and *the law of my mind* still in bondage; in the state of regeneration it is between the flesh and *the Spirit* who makes *free from the law of sin and of death.*

Rom. vii. 23. Rom. viii. 2.

12. What two mistakes must be guarded against?

Setting the standard of regeneration too high or too low.

13. How are these to be avoided?

(1) By remembering that in the regenerate life the old

man has yet to be mortified, and the new man to grow up to perfection ; that this life like all life has its stages.

(2) By remembering that the regenerate estate is described in a number of definitions which all have their unity in the indwelling of Christ. The begetting, the seed, the quickening, the birth, must all be explained of the one blessing, the *newness of life* in the fellowship of the Holy Trinity through the Son. *It pleased God . . . to reveal His Son in me.* Rom. vi. 4. Gal. i. 15, 17

14. What errors have been held as to the means or instrumentalities of regeneration?

First of all that which makes the incarnation as such the means: it is not the doctrine of Scripture that the descendants of the first Adam are either justified or regenerate or sanctified through the virtue of the Second Adam. *If any man be in Christ he is a new creature.* The free gift abounds unto the many as a race, but it must be individually applied. 2 Cor. v. 17.

15. And what errors have been prevalent as to its connection with baptism?

Too much stress has been laid upon this sacrament as the ordained and only means of regenerating grace : the germ of this is seen in the early fathers, its full development in the mediæval church, and many of the formularies of the Reformation, especially the Lutheran and Anglican, retain its traces.

16. What is the defence against this error as it respects regeneration in particular?

(1) It should be remembered that baptism is the seal of all the blessings of the covenant, and not of the new birth apart and alone ; the term baptismal may as well be applied to justification and sanctification as to regeneration.

(2) Scripture connects the new birth with baptism, which is its ordained seal and pledge ; but the covenant seal may assure the believer of a past fact, of a present gift, or of a blessing yet to come. Union with Christ is symbolised in this sacrament, which however is, like circumcision, of no avail apart from faith. In Christianity there is no grace "ex opere operato," or dependent on official acts. Acts x. 47. Acts xxii. 16. Acts ii. 38.

17. How are the Lutheran, Anglican and Presbyterian formularies, which assert the regeneration of infants in baptism, evangelically explained?

(1) Some contend that as children are capable of the infection of original sin, they are also capable of the Spirit's grace in infancy: these two being necessarily correlative.

(2) The Lutherans further plead that the regeneration of infants is the new-begetting, while the future voluntary union with Christ is the new birth.

(3) Those who hold the Westminster Confession assume that in the case of elect children the grace of the new life is sealed and conveyed in the sacrament of baptism.

(4) It is very commonly held that the term regeneration as applied to infants refers rather to the outward privileges of sonship than to any regenerating grace conferred on them. This was a very prevalent view in the early church.

18. But may children be said to be capable of receiving regenerating grace?

It is enough to plead for them that they are adopted into the family of God and church of Christ. The inward work of the Christian Sonship waits for their conscious acceptance of the Lord. They receive the grace which prepares for regeneration, even as it prepares for righteousness in union with Him.

III.

Christian Sanctification.

§ 1. Sanctification.

1. What do we mean by Christian sanctification?

The whole estate of believers as they are made partakers of Divine holiness and consecrated to the fellowship and service of God through the Mediator.

2. How is this related to the two former estates?

Righteousness regards the regenerate as conformed to the law of God and sanctification as conformed to the Divine

nature. In other words the new life is in the former set right with law, and in the latter is united with God Himself.

3. Is sanctification, then, only a distinct branch of the common Christian privilege?

In one sense it must be studied as such. But in another it covers the whole ground, and all religion may be expressed in terms of sanctification. For the regenerate life is the Spirit of holiness in the nature, making regeneration and sanctification really one; while our sanctification is *the will of God* as expressed in law, and our being cleansed *from all unrighteousness* and kept blameless. The three are profoundly one.

1 Thess. iv. 3.
1 John i. 9.

4. How is this further illustrated by the terminology?

All the terms of sanctification—such as consecration to God, purification from sin, holiness, with many expressing the means by which these are attained and their relations to each other—were used in the Old Testament to describe the full covenant relations of Jehovah with His people, especially as He was manifested in His temple. They are all hallowed afresh in Christ, with a deeper meaning and with the same comprehensiveness of range.

5. How with a deeper meaning?

(1) Sanctification—whether as washing or laying on the altar—was in the Levitical economy chiefly, though not wholly, external for the purifying of the flesh and keeping the people as such dedicated to God. In the New Testament *Ye shall be holy!* never rests short of interior union with God: *As He which called you is holy, be ye yourselves also holy in all manner of living.* Holiness is impressed on the entire nature.

1 Peter i. 15, 16.

(2) Moreover, in the new covenant, righteousness and the new life in Christ throw their deep meaning on sanctification.

6. What are the two leading ideas in holiness?

Separation FROM sin and UNTO God; these being necessarily one, but by equal necessity viewed as distinct, though not to be divided in time. The one must imply the other.

7. Is not holiness the internal quality as shown in a holy life and character?

Yes, when viewed in the ethics of Christianity: we now consider it only or chiefly as the application of the atonement by the Spirit.

8. But is not the external or objective application of the atonement our justification?

Yes, as the atonement is an obedience offered to justice; but as it is a sacrifice of expiation its application is both our external and our internal sanctification.

9. Are there two classes of terms for this external and internal sanctification?

The terms are not sharply defined any more than in external and internal righteousness and sonship. Ἁγιάζειν, to sanctify or hallow to God, embraces both; so does καθαρίζειν, to cleanse or purify; and ἁγιασμός, sanctification, like ἅγιος, saint, unites the two. But the external and internal meanings of all these terms are almost always actually or virtually blended.

10. How may we sum up this before we proceed?

We must remember that the estate of the Christian, in the inmost sanctuary of the new covenant, is both an external status or position, and an internal condition or character. As a child of God he has the real new life and is in a state of sonship; as righteous he is in the state of justification and has the law written on his heart; as sanctified to God, his state is that of a consecrated person and his quality or inward condition is that of purity. But the external in all these gives him his name: he is a justified and consecrated son of God.

11. It follows then that all who are regenerate and justified are sanctified also?

Most assuredly. They have, through that common grace, acceptance as pardon at the bar, acceptance as the adoption of sons, and acceptance on the altar as the consecrated property and servants of God: in all these senses they have the *grace* Eph. i. 6. *which He freely bestowed on us in the Beloved.*

§ 2. Sanctification as External.

1. Have we any instances of the external or objective application in Scripture?

(1) Whatever is set apart from common to sacred use is said to be sanctified: as time in the Sabbath; place in the temple and city of Zion; and everything laid on the altar *that sanctifieth the gift.* (2) The holy NAME, or *Christ as Lord*, is to be hallowed, as already holy, in the human heart. (3) The persons of believers are holy as separated from the world.

Matt. xxiii. 19. Matt. vi. 9. 1 Peter iii. 15. 1 Peter ii. 9.

2. Does this last illustration hold good?

Christians are called saints (ἅγιοι, saints), just as they are called children of God and righteous, apart from their internal character, although it is the supposition of that internal character which justifies the name. Christians are *sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints:* TO BE is not in the text, but it represents the truth. God makes us what He reputes us to be.

1 Cor. i. 2.

To sanctify to God being the Divine term, what is the corresponding human?

We dedicate to God, present at the altar, consecrate in intention, what only the Holy Spirit sanctifies to God.

4. Then external sanctification is the consecration by the Spirit of what man presents?

The sinner conscious of defilement offers himself to God and is accepted for the sake of the atonement he pleads; that acceptance is his cleansing from sin or sanctification.

5. Is this the same as pardon and adoption?

Yes: δικαιοῦν or justify in the court, is καθαρίζειν or cleanse in the temple. So the accepted worshipper in the temple is the son in the house and before the bar he is justified.

6. How is sin viewed in this connection?

As defilement or spot (macula): that uncleanness or vileness which God hateth, because it is not like His own nature. In external sanctification He does not see that spot or take

account of it; just as in justification He does not reckon the offence. The atonement has shown why.

7. What terms express the application of the atonement?

Terms derived from the old economy: sprinkling the blood, cleansing the conscience, washing from iniquity, purifying the heart or purging the conscience.

8. Sprinkling and washing may be external: can cleansing and purifying be so too?

In such passages as *Purifying their heart by faith; The blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin; Cleanse your hands, ye sinners*—the same word καθαρίζειν is used, and must have an external rather than an internal meaning. But purging and purifying are commonly used rather of the internal work.

Acts xv. 9. 1 John i. 7. Jas. iv. 8.

9. In what sense is the conscience said to be purged?

The conscience of guilt is also the conscience of defilement. When the offering of Christ is said to *purge* (or *cleanse*) *our conscience from dead works*, the meaning is that the believer's heart is delivered from the sense of both guilt and of defilement from which *dead works* could not deliver, *to serve the living God*. It may be added that the old judicial term—expurgation from guilt—helps us to understand this external purging of the conscience. Another and stronger word is used by the Apostle when the more internal cleansing is meant: *Purge out the old leaven* (ἐκκαθάρατε) from the church.

Heb. ix. 14.

1 Cor. v. 7.

10. Then we are sanctified to the service of God?

Sanctification negatively is cleansing from sin, positively it is consecration to God's fellowship and possession. The former, that is communion with God, belongs rather to internal sanctification; the latter, that is the being set apart to Divine use, belongs rather to external or objective sanctification.

11. In what sense is Christ made unto us sanctification?

He is made unto us ἁγιασμός, not ἁγιωσύνη: our sanctification to God by Himself, not our inward holiness. Of the latter He is the indirect source, as He accomplishes our holiness by

His Spirit and with our co-operation; of the former, as of our justification, He is the direct source and only ground. Thus we have a justifying and a sanctifying God in Christ alone.

§ 3. Sanctification as Internal.

1. What are the evidences that sanctification is an internal process running parallel with the external?

Those passages which represent it as progressive and perfected: and some words which have an interior meaning.

2. Is outward consecration spoken of otherwise?

Throughout the Old Testament and the New, things and persons dedicated to God are regarded as His through one act of giving and receiving on the altar, *the altar that sanctifieth the gift.* It is an acceptance once for all. Matt. xxiii. 19.

3. Is there a change of phrase to denote the distinction between external and internal sanctification?

Generally, there is not; but the construction of the words and the context show the difference with sufficient clearness.

4. Give some illustrations of this.

(1) Our Lord is said to have once *made purification of sins*, and to have *put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself*: both these terms include the provision for the outward and inward application of His sacrifice. Heb. i. 3. Heb. ix. 26.

(2) Hence cleansing and washing and purifying are used of both; but *Wash away my sins* refers rather to the external putting away of sin, while *Wash me throughly from mine iniquity* and *Cleanse us from all unrighteousness*, seem also to carry the process into the inner man. Acts xxii. 16. Ps. li. 2. 1 John i. 9.

5. Where have we the process and the end of sanctification combined?

Let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God: here holiness is the end or τέλος, and cleansing the process which, though not precisely as gradual here, aims at it. And the saints are spoken of as ἁγιαζόμενοι, *those who are in course of sanctification.* 2 Cor. vii. 1. Heb. x. 14.

6. Do not these passages connect sanctification with ethical duty and personal discipline?

Yes: it is remarkable that the word cleanse or purify, strictly appropriate only to the Spirit's work, should be assigned to man's act. But so it is; and everywhere our gradual sanctification is bound up with our Christian discipline.

7. But are there no words which belong only to internal or subjective sanctification?

(1) The adjective pure or clean has an interior meaning: *Blessed are the pure in heart.* (2) Another verb is also used, ἁγνίζειν, which goes to the inmost nature: *Every one that hath this hope set on Him, purifieth himself even as He is pure.* Observe that to the Lord Himself the words that denote internal purification are never applied. Ἁγνός here is a peculiarity.

Matt. v. 8.
1 John iii. 3.

8. What is meant by entire sanctification?

This is the work of the Holy Spirit alone, applying the virtue of the atonement in the removal of the last trace of the indwelling or pollution of sin and consecrating the entire nature of the believer to God in perfected love.

9. Where is this promised?

Generally by all the assurances of salvation or redemption from sin; but, in reference to sanctification itself, especially by the Apostle's prayer, *The God of peace Himself sanctify you wholly:* with its pledge of Divine fidelity for full assurance.

1 Thess. v. 23, 24.

10. What is the force of this passage?

Two words are used in it that express completeness: ὁλοτελεῖς, meaning that the subjects of this sanctification are perfectly sanctified; and another ὁλόκληρον, which shows that the former referred to the individual as composed of body and soul and spirit, *preserved entire, without blame.*

1 Thess. v. 23.

11. What preeminence is here observable in sanctification?

It is a hallowing of the whole nature of man. Our right-eousness before God is in the spirit: *the spirit is life*

Rom. viii. 10.

because of righteousness. Our sonship leaves the body *dead because of sin;* but our sanctification views even the perishing physical frame as entirely the Lord's: *Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?* Rom. viii. 10. 1 Cor. vi. 19.

12. Do not some other passages teach the entireness of sanctification?

(1) There are some which refer to the crucifixion of the flesh and the destruction of the body of sin; these really belong not to sanctification but to the growth of the regenerate life.

(2) Others that allude to the law as fulfilled in us belong to the life of righteousness.

(3) We have to do now with sanctification proper, which is simply and solely the removal of the spot or defilement that is contrary to the holiness of the Divine nature.

13. But to return: What is meant by the Spirit's application of the virtue of the atonement?

The virtue or efficacy of the atonement is direct or indirect: direct in the abolishing of the alienation or wall of partition between man and God, which is its virtue proper; and indirect, in obtaining the power of the Holy Ghost which carries its virtue into the inner man.

14. Is the gift of the Spirit, as the virtue of the atonement, more than purification from inward sin?

Yes, it is the secret of communion or fellowship with God, of which purification is the condition. We are made, through the *communion of the Holy Ghost*, gradually to *become partakers of the Divine nature*, and *partakers of His holiness.* 2 Cor. xiii. 14. 2 Pet. i. 4. Heb. xii. 10.

15. What means or instrumentalities are generally connected with internal sanctification?

(1) The word of truth: *Sanctify them in the truth; Thy word is truth.* But the truth is the instrument of salvation under every aspect of the estate of grace. John xvii. 17.

(2) Sacramental means seal the covenant of sanctification: these are still the word as expressed in act, and as such convey

the grace of which they are signs. Here also we must remember that every blessing of the new covenant is included.

(3) If such language may be used, the sacred presence of the Holy Trinity in Christ is the means of sanctification, and necessarily of entire sanctification. The prayer for the indwelling of Christ has this object, *that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God.*

Eph. iii. 19.

(4) In a very important sense, the might of Divine love is the instrument of this as of every effect of Divine grace: *His love is perfected in us.*

1 John iv. 12.

16. What is the relation of repentance and faith to entire sanctification?

Repentance is in the consecrated soul an habitual loathing of sin as remaining defilement; faith is the conviction that it may be entirely removed, and the instrument in man that obtains its removal: actively laying hold of the promise and passively receiving its fulfilment.

17. Does any promise encourage this faith?

(1) When, under the influence of the Spirit, faith beholds Christ as having in Himself *no sin*, and as *manifested to take away sins*, it has promise enough for its encouragement.

1 John iii. 5.

(2) *By grace are ye saved through faith:* salvation is redemption from all sin in this world, since there is no purgatorial purification after death.

Eph. ii. 8.

(3) Faith therefore, *working through love* as a condition, is the final and only instrument in man for the attainment of the Spirit's grace in the utter destruction of evil as defilement and all that is called sin.

Gal. v. 6.

§ 4. Historical.

1. How has the doctrine of sanctification been held in the Christian Church?

It is found in every system of teaching; but its development has been clouded by many misconceptions, and as a doctrine it has not had a sufficiently distinct place.

2. What was the first error observable?

(1) In early times it was not distinguished from Christian perfection generally, of which however it is only one aspect. (2) Internal righteousness and internal sanctification were regarded as one and the same thing. (3) Both these errors are found in various forms down to the Reformation, and have not been wanting since.

3. What effect has the former had?

Besides throwing the terminology of the New Testament into confusion, it tended in earlier times to abolish the Spirit's sanctifying office, by making sanctification only the progress of the soul towards ethical perfection: of which more hereafter.

4. What have been the effects of the latter?

They may be traced in three lines:

(1) In mediæval and tridentine theology, sanctification is no other than progressive justification. The inherent grace infused, or the indwelling of Christ by His Spirit, is the common source of both; but without remembering that the common fountain sends forth separate streams.

(2) In Lutheran theology, justification is mainly limited to the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and sanctification is actually or virtually limited to the good works which are the fruits of justification. Hence in its dogmatics and expository books sanctification, as such, occupies a small place.

(3) In the Reformed or Calvinistic theology, sanctification is either the gradual development of the holy dispositions implanted in the new birth, and therefore progressive regeneration; or it is the imputation of Christ's holiness as His perfect obedience to the law. In both cases sanctification loses its specific character as the removal of unholiness.

5. How are we protected from these several errors?

From all alike by remembering that the Three Estates of covenanted salvation are mutually complementary, each being perfect and complete in itself. But, particularly:

(1) Righteousness is our conformity to the justice of God

guarding His righteous law; sanctification is our conformity to His holiness which guards His holy nature.

(2) The new life is not developed in sanctification. It simply grows up into Christ: sanctification is not the deepening of life but the hallowing that life to God.

(3) Good works, which all these systems place under the head of sanctification, have no more to do with it than with righteousness or the new life. They belong to ethics, being the common condition and result of all.

6. But does not the New Testament invariably go on from justification through the new life to the good works of holiness?

Much theology travels in that course; but the New Testament never does. The idea of law is predominant in the Epistle to the Romans; that of holiness in the Epistle to the Hebrews; but good works in the newness of life belong to both. Good works are *the fruits of righteousness;*

Phil. i. 11. we are *created in Christ Jesus for good works;* and

Eph. ii. 10. Rom. vi. 22. these righteous evidences of the Spirit of life are

Eph. iv. 24. *fruit unto sanctification:* not so much fruits of sanctification as themselves to be sanctified, εἰς ἁγιασμόν. Mark how the three estates are united: We are enjoined to *put on the new man, which after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth.*

7. What was the early doctrine of the Arminians on this subject?

Arminius was among the first to distinguish clearly between sanctification and justification: teaching that the former is a gradual purification from sin. But he also confounded it with the gradual death of the old man; and left it uncertain whether or not the death of the body is the final end of sin in the nature. Nor was this point decided by his followers.

8. Where else is the same confusion to be seen?

In both Lutheran and Reformed theology, which regard

Gal. v. 17. death as the sanctifier, and hold that *the flesh lusteth against the Spirit* to the end: a subtile relic of Gnosticism.

9. But is not St. Paul's teaching in the same strain?

He introduces the conflict only to show its effect in this, *that ye may not do the things that ye would.* Meanwhile, *they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh;* and crucifixion is unto death. But this has to do directly with regeneration, and with sanctification indirectly: so far that is as the flesh cannot as tainted with sin enter into heaven, any more than flesh and blood. Gal. v. 17, 24.

10. Has the present privilege of deliverance from the last taint or spot of sin been ever taught in the Christian Church?

Not explicitly by any branch of it until the Methodist theology made this entire sanctification prominent.

11. Was it then implicitly taught by any?

Yes, by all; but not as a privilege attainable during the probation of life. The highest teaching from Augustine downwards made the reservation that the conflict with the remainder, however slight, of sin, is a necessary part of the probation of the believer's humility.

12. How does Methodist theology deal with this?

(1) By insisting that the perfect love of God is shed abroad in the heart, and that this must needs extinguish the very principle of self which is the true defilement of original sin; (2) by its doctrine of Christian Perfection generally.

13. What is this doctrine?

That the Christian covenant makes provision for the completeness of the estate of believers in every relation, entire sanctification being only one of these. This will be our next subject: for this completeness is Christian perfection.

14. Meanwhile, what tendencies to error are still to be guarded against in the doctrine of entire sanctification?

(1) Entire consecration to God is sometimes held to be the whole of sanctification, whereas it is the external act of the

Spirit, which, however blessed in itself, is to be followed by an internal purification from the last remains of the carnal mind.

(2) This internal purification, though in its completeness an instant and decisive act of the same Spirit, is the crown of penitent faith. The believer's repentance must bring forth its own fruits in the mortification of indwelling sin, *fruit unto sanctification*. There is danger of neglecting this condition of the supreme gift.

Rom. vi. 22.

(3) It may be added that there is danger also of forgetting the distinction between sanctification and entire sanctification: as if holiness or consecration to God were a second blessing bestowed at some interval after believing. Its entireness may be called a second blessing, but holiness itself begins the life of acceptance. The Holy Spirit as a sanctifier is given, not after an interval, but when we believe. *In Whom, having also believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is an earnest of our inheritance*, as we are children, and, as we are sanctified, *unto the redemption of God's own possession.*

Eph. i. 13, 14.

(4) A distinct assurance, connected with the moment of final deliverance from sin, and as it were apart from the silent seal of the indwelling Spirit, is sometimes looked for without any express warrant of Scripture.

(5) Other safeguards lead us to our next subject, the doctrine of Christian Perfection.

IV.

Christian Perfection.

§ 1. Evangelical Perfection in the New Testament.

1. What is the meaning of the word Perfection?

(1) Positively, that is perfect which has reached a designed end (τέλος). (2) Negatively, that which lacks nothing included in that end.

2. How is it applied to the Supreme Being?

To God this definition cannot apply. He absolutely is

perfect, without end or attainment. But perfection is attributed to Him in relation to the creature, as the final moral standard. *Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.* Matt. v. 48.

3. How is it applicable to creatures?

They may be relatively perfect: either as answering to the Divine purpose in their creation, or as having after failure reached it again.

4. How is it applied to men in particular?

(1) Man's perfection is to him only restoration; and that (2) only as under the economy of grace.

5. What was the original perfection of man, and in what sense did he lose it?

He was created in union with God, with all in his nature that was necessary for the beginning of a perfect course of development. As separated from God by sin, his natural course of perfection was suspended and must be begun again after a supernatural order.

6. What is the relation of grace to man's perfection?

Through the mediation of a perfect Saviour man recovers his original perfection and more than that.

7. How may the perfection of the Mediator be viewed?

Under several most important aspects:

(1) He was in the incarnation perfect man: perfect, that is, in spiritual union or rather unity with God, but for the sake of redemption sharing the infirmities of fallen man.

(2) He was as *the Author of their salvation* made *perfect through sufferings:* that is, perfected in all that was required to fill up the idea of an atoning Saviour. Heb. ii. 10.

(3) His atonement introduced a perfect method of recovery in relation to the legal economy which *made nothing perfect.* Heb. vii. 19.

(4) Being Himself perfected, *By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified:* that is, He has made eternal provision for their complete restoration. Heb. x. 14.

(5) He Himself is the model to which their perfection is to be conformed.

8. Under what aspects is the perfection of His people viewed?

These again are various and should be studied in order:

(1) There is a relative perfection in conversion or the beginning of the Christian discipleship: *If thou wouldest be perfect!* referred to a preparatory and perfect readiness for the discipline of a further perfection.

Matt. xix. 21.

(2) The believer receives a perfect salvation as it is the enjoyment of outward privilege. In all respects he is placed in a perfect relation to God through grace.

(3) It is perfect maturity in the Faith as opposed to the childhood of the Law. *We speak wisdom among the perfect.*

1 Cor. ii. 6.

(4) There is presented to faith an internal perfection of salvation from sin and conformity with the righteousness and holiness of God: of which more hereafter.

(5) There is a standard of ethical perfection which runs parallel with this at all points.

(6) Then comes the perfect consummation in another state, both of body and soul: meanwhile, *the spirits of just men* are *made perfect* in death.

Heb. xii. 23.

(7) Final perfection is the progressive realisation by man throughout eternity of the original purpose of the Creator.

9. What do we mean by the second of these?

That the Holy Spirit so applies the atoning work to believers united to Christ that they may be and are made perfect in the restoration of their forfeited relation to God.

10. What is the relation of this to union with Christ?

In Him alone, through union with Him by faith, we have in time and eternity our acceptance: *perfect in Christ*, and *in Him complete* or *made full; Who was made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.*

Col. i. 28.
Col. ii. 10.
1 Cor. i. 30.

(1) Hence believers have *become the righteousness of God in Him;* (2) in Him they are sons of God: *ye are all sons of God in Christ Jesus, through faith;* and (3) they are at once *sanctified in Jesus Christ:* sanctified *once for all.*

2 Cor. v. 21.
Gal. iii. 26.
1 Cor. i. 2.
Heb. x. 10.

11. What is the testimony of Scripture as to internal perfection?

In all descriptions of the estate of grace we are taught to expect a finished work in this world: in other words Christian moral perfection: that is, a state in which nothing is wanting.

(1) As to our righteousness: the grace of the Spirit is given for our moral conformity to the will and nature of God: *that the ordinance* or *requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us; He that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous.* These passages must not be limited. Rom. viii. 4. 1 John iii. 7.

(2) As to our sonship: being *foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son*, our *old man was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be done away*, that *we may grow up in all things into Him*; whence *as He is, even so are we in this world.* Nor should these be limited. Rom. viii. 29. Rom. vi. 6. Eph. iv. 15. 1 John iv. 17.

(3) As to our sanctification: the provision of grace is sufficient for the removal of all unholiness: *Ye shall be holy for I am holy*, and *preserved entire, without blame.* 1 Peter i. 16. 1 Thess. v. 23.

12. How is the love of God connected with this?

(1) That love in Christ is pledged to our salvation. As it is the source so it is the agent and finisher of all: *His love is perfected in us.* 1 John iv. 12.

(2) It is the might that vanquishes and expels sin, as the instrument of the *Spirit of life.* Rom. viii. 2.

(3) In its return to God is the *bond of perfectness* in us. Col. iii. 14.

13. Then love is the bond that unites the Spirit's work and our own?

Yes; the perfecting of the love of God in us is the Spirit's operation, and our love perfected in return is the whole of our perfection. Love is the supreme word in heaven and on earth.

14. What is the relation between the perfection given and the perfection wrought in us?

We must regard the ethical perfection of character as (1) the condition on which the effectual operation of grace depends, and (2) the necessary effect and exhibition of that

grace. In either case, the perfect work of grace must have the preeminence.

15. How is ethical perfection generally described?

(1) As the completeness of a moral character, formed under the influence of Divine grace. *The God of peace . . . make you perfect in every good thing to do His will.* Heb. xiii. 20, 21. (2) As the growth to perfection of individual grace: Jas. i. 4. for instance, *And let patience have its perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, lacking in nothing.* 1 John iv. 15. *Perfect love casteth out fear.*

16. Still, perfection is the administration of the Spirit?

Yes; for *every good giving and every perfect gift is from above.* The discipline of a holy life belongs to Jas. i. 17. Christian ethics, but its perfection belongs to our present section.

17. How may we reconcile it with human imperfection?

By remembering that (1) it is the perfection of the redeemed amidst all the limitations of sense and infirmity; and (2) that it is Christian or Evangelical perfection, that is, perfection as so reckoned in the economy of grace, preserved in us, as it is imparted, only through our faith in the atone- 1 Cor. xiii. 10. ment; and (3) that there is a future of unlimited progress, *when that which is perfect is come.*

§ 2. Historical.

1. What has been the place of Christian perfection in Christian theology?

All systems of doctrine have included it, though mostly without giving it a formal and distinct place. No theological question has been more variously handled and more persistently obscured.

2. How may we classify errors on this subject?

Under two heads: (1) theories of perfection which have severed it from the fundamentals of Christianity; (2) those which have erred as to the relation between perfection as a gift of grace and perfection as wrought in the believer.

3. Where do we find the former?

In all Pelagian teaching, which denies original sin in man and redemption from sin in Christ.

4. What forms has this error assumed?

(1) Pelagius himself held a very consistent doctrine: in his system the will of every man is what it was in Adam, and may reach perfection as his might have reached it: the teaching of law and the example of Christ are enough.

(2) There is a Pelagian philosophy of human progress which makes its watchword the perfectibility of humanity as a whole: this, however, has not the relation with Christianity that even Pelagius had.

(3) And in Unitarian systems, holding the Gospel to be the highest instrument of human discipline, by which man may reach the only perfection that an infirm creature, in the midst of temptation, may attain.

5. What errors are observable in more Christian teaching as to the relation between perfection as a gift of grace and as a work in the believer?

These may be again classed under two heads: first, that which, making redemption mainly a provision to release man from inability, regards perfection rather as his own attainment; and, secondly, that of those who make it simply and solely a gift in union with Christ.

6. What ground is common to these?

They agree in regarding Christ's work as the ultimate ground of man's perfection; and again they agree in making perfection in man himself unattainable in this life.

7. Where lies the truth of Scripture as between these?

In holding that the perfect work of Christ FOR us is to be perfectly wrought out IN us.

8. What has been the general character of the former error?

It has made Christian perfection a discipline of asceticism with the grace of the Gospel behind it.

9. What is asceticism?

Its Scriptural expression is *Exercise thyself unto godliness.* St. Paul gave the word, and illustrated it by his example: *I keep under my body and bring it into bondage,* and *Herein do I also exercise* (ἀσκῶ) *myself to have a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men always.* Thus the Apostle recommends asceticism, but guards it: in his teaching it is the constant care of self, in order to godliness and the discharge of every duty to man.

1 Tim. iv. 7. 1 Cor. ix. 27. Acts xxiv. 16.

10. Into what error has asceticism fallen in the pursuit of Christian perfection?

(1) Its aim has been right: the entire victory of the spirit over the flesh, to be attained by fasting, mortification of the appetites; total abstraction from the world; the absolute suppression of the will, or its annihilation in the will of God; and in all things the walking *not uncertainly.*

1 Cor. ix. 26.

(2) But its means have been often devices of undue severity, weakening and dishonouring the body as the instrument of God's service.

(3) And, chiefly, it has not sufficiently acknowledged the Spirit of holiness as the supreme and indeed the sole administrator of Christian perfection.

11. Wherein has the mystical theory of perfection differed from this?

There have been two kinds of mysticism; a false one tending to Pantheism, and a true one filled with the Spirit of love.

(1) False mysticism has thrown aside all means, and sought to be independent both of ascetic discipline and the virtue of the atonement; aiming at a quietistic and direct absorption of the soul in the contemplation of God.

(2) True mysticism, in every communion, has sought to unite asceticism and dependence on the Spirit, by the three principles of purification, illumination, and union with God.

12. What error may be discovered here?

Simply that the three stages have been too clearly marked

and made too distinct. The suppression of evil does not lead to the enlightenment of the Spirit and union with God: they all go together in an undistinguishable progress to perfection. Moreover, mysticism, like asceticism, never included in its doctrine the Spirit's power in the removal of all sin.

13. These theories of Christian perfection tended to lower the direct administration of the Spirit: were there any that exaggerated it?

Almost from the Apostles' days there has been a stream of tendency to regard the Holy Spirit as promised and given in a dispensation distinct from the ordinary dispensation of Christian privilege.

(1) This was seen in the Gnostics of the second century, who called themselves "the perfect" as being delivered from matter and the flesh.

(2) Also in the Montanists, who distinguished themselves as "the Spiritual" from "the Carnal:" as under the last and best dispensation of the Spirit.

(3) In the middle ages "the Perfect Ones" or "Catharists" made the same claim under many denominations.

(4) Some remainder of this ancient error may be found in those who regard the Spirit of power from on high as a gift supplementary to the first faith in Christ that brings acceptance, and necessary to its completion.

14. What is the common refutation of all these errors?

The descent of the Holy Ghost on the Church and every individual of it on the day of Pentecost. *In Whom, having also believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise. Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now perfected in the flesh?* Eph. i. 13. Gal. iii. 3.

15. How does this last passage bear on our present review?

It shows that the Spirit, the bestowment of Whom begins the reign of grace in us, is the same who perfects it; it is His administration from first to last. He is the earliest seal of every privilege, and, in the name of Jesus, the finisher of our salvation: we may be perfected in the Spirit.

16. What are the peculiarities of Romanist teaching?

It has many varieties; but, as authoritatively laid down, its principles are these:

(1) As to the law: it is possible for man to render a perfect obedience to the spirit and essence of the moral law, as that law applies to man "in this state of life."

(2) As to deliverance from evil: concupiscence as sin is removed; but as the possible "fuel of sin" it is never taken away. The venial sins, or sins of defect, which may spring from it, do not affect the state of grace or righteousness. Moreover, these venial sins may utterly cease, and then the concupiscence itself is no more sin than it was in Adam.

(3) Love, being sundered from law, may rise above mere obedience, and perform works of supererogation: following the counsels of a special perfection.

17. What is meant by the counsels of perfection?

Certain commandments of our Lord which were given on special occasions have been taken as pointing out the way of a peculiar and higher perfection, counselled and recommended but not made imperative. Thus absolute poverty, chastity, and obedience or renunciation of the will, have been established as the three watchwords of a higher level of the "religious" life.

18. Where lies the error in this?

It sets up two standards of perfect devotion where there can be but one; it forgets that the spirit of poverty, chastity and obedience is the mark of every Christian, to be exemplified in every kind of life; and, as bound up with the idea of merit achieved beyond the ordinary range of obedience, with the system of indulgences based upon it, the theory contradicts the doctrines of grace and has introduced great evils into the church.

19. What elements of good remain in the mediæval and tridentine teaching?

It strongly asserted the possibility of presenting to God an obedience which He counts perfect; it exhibited the germ of a

sound distinction between the sin to which the will consents and the remainder of sin which is not imputed as such; it kept alive the salutary thought of a perpetual self-discipline co-operating with Divine grace.

20. How was this good neutralised?

The first by the perfect obedience being regarded as the special gift of God on certain evangelical conditions; the second by reckoning concupiscence to be in no sense sin; and the third by building on it a superstructure of meritorious works. Generally, the whole doctrine of Christian perfection in this system does not give the Holy Spirit His preeminence as the sole administrator to all who believe of an objective and subjective completeness in Christ.

21. How may we define the second class of errors on this subject?

Its root is the assumption that the only Christian perfection is the Spirit's application to the soul of Christ's finished work: His passive righteousness for its deliverance from condemnation in time and in eternity; His active righteousness for its presentation before God, perfect and complete, as having in Him perfectly kept the law.

22. What is, generally, the cardinal error here?

The exaggeration of our Lord's vicarious relation in the atonement.

23. How may we trace its operation?

(1) It leaves out one branch of the Scriptural teaching as to union with Christ, that *he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit:* the Spirit of union produces a spirit entirely one with the Lord's. (2) While professing to magnify the law as perfectly kept only by Christ, and never to be kept by fallen man, it forgets that our Lord's own obedience was that of perfect love, and that perfect love is reckoned for our obedience; (3) it steadfastly undervalues and misinterprets the many passages which enjoin and pray for a state of Christian perfection in the believer himself.

1 Cor. vi. 17.

24. What is the obvious peril of this?

Antinomianism, as a theoretical and practical exaggeration of evangelical freedom from law.

25. Is this danger essentially inherent in the Calvinistic system?

By no means: in the best of their writers and saints their doctrine is an intense incitement to personal holiness. For, (1) they make interior conformity with Christ the object of a ceaseless pursuit, the attainment however being a gift sealed only in death; and (2) they regard the gift of an eternal sanctification in Christ as a motive to infinite gratitude, and the most absolute selfabasement, in the present life.

26. What were the views of the Arminians or Remonstrants?

(1) They taught that the law may be kept through love in what God reckons a perfect fulfilment: the strictest rigour of law being abated in the covenant of grace. (2) That sanctification is a daily process in which sin becomes weaker and the new nature stronger. (3) The final deliverance from inbred sin—whether to be expected before death or only in death—they left undetermined.

27. How did they turn their doctrine against the Romanist?

Agreeing with Rome that the new covenant has delivered men from the rigour of the perfect law—whether as a condition of salvation or as a standard of possible attainment—they opposed Rome by maintaining that Christian perfection must at best be a merciful imputation, and that therefore any merit beyond commanded duty is impossible.

28. How did they use it as against the Calvinists, their nearer opponents?

Agreeing with them that Christ is the one and only ground of our acceptance and sanctification, they insisted against them that the office of the Holy Spirit is to impress upon the soul the Lord's image and to work in it a righteousness conformed to His and accepted as such.

29. What modifications of Arminian doctrine on this particular subject have appeared in later times?

These have had reference mainly to the sense in which the law, as the standard of perfection, is supposed to be graciously modified. (1) The Arminians held that the original moral law is displaced by *the law of Christ* or the *law of faith*: being no longer the condition of either present or future acceptance; though, as summed up in love, it is still the rule of duty. (2) But it has been laid down by many, especially the theologians of the Oberlin school in America, that there is no moral law incumbent on man but that which is within the power of the fallen subject of it: the law is not mercifully transfigured in Christ, but in sheer justice accommodated to human weakness. (3) The Methodist doctrine has avoided this latter error by teaching, not the lowering of the law, but a special kind of obedience which is counted perfection: Christian perfection is the perfect performance of the conditions of the Gospel.

Gal. vi 2. Rom. iii. 27.

30. In what relation to this do the views of the Friends as to the perfection of the work of grace stand?

Their doctrine is a combination of Mysticism and Arminianism. The following sentences from Barclay's Apology shew how high it is and how much nearer to the Methodist doctrine than any other. "Though we judge so of the best works performed by man, endeavouring a conformity with the outward law by his own strength, and in his own will, yet we believe that such works as naturally proceed from this spiritual birth and formation of Christ in us are pure and holy, even as the root from whence they come; therefore God accepts them, justifies us in them, and rewards us for them in His own free grace." The redemption wrought FOR US and IN US is "as the free gift of God, able to counterbalance, overcome, and root out the evil seed wherewith we are naturally, as in the Fall, leavened." This firm statement is, however, sometimes modified.

31. What, more particularly, are the main elements of the Methodist teaching on Christian perfection?

They may be best stated in the words of John Wesley.

which must be quoted, as the teaching of Christian perfection is generally held to be a peculiarity of Methodism.

(1) As to the perfect fulfilling of the law: "Faith working or animated by love is all that God requires of man. He has substituted (not sincerity, but) love in the room of angelic perfection." The perfect love of God and man, shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost, is both all law and all obedience to law: this as to Christian righteousness.

(2) As to deliverance from sin in the nature. This is regarded as the perfect life of regeneration in the death of the old man or inbred sin. "In like manner, he may be dying to sin for some time; yet he is not dead to sin, till sin is separated from his soul, and in that instant he lives the full life of love:" "the moment wherein sin ceases to be," or "when, after having been fully convinced of inbred sin, by a far deeper and clearer conviction than that he experienced before justification, and after having experienced a gradual mortification of it, he experiences a total death to sin, and an entire renewal in the love and image of God." This as to Christian sonship.

(3) As to the relation of this to our holiness: "The term SANCTIFIED is continually applied by St. Paul to all who are justified; by this term alone he rarely if ever means 'saved from all sin'; consequently, it is not proper to use it in that sense without adding the word WHOLLY, ENTIRELY, or the like." This as to Christian sanctification.

32. What is the cardinal principle in the teaching as a whole?

(1) "Pure love reigning alone in the heart and life: this is the whole of Scriptural perfection." But love is invariably exhibited as the unwearied energy of all good works.

(2) That perfection is solely the Spirit's work in the believer; but implies his most strenuous co-operation: as to the former, it is received merely by faith, and hence may be given instantaneously, "in a moment"; as to the latter, "there is a gradual work, both preceding and following that instant."

33. On a review of the entire subject, what do we learn?

That there is no consistent doctrine of Christian perfection

which does not so honour the virtue of the atonement and the Spirit's application of it as to teach the possibility of a full salvation from the indwelling of sin and the perfect restoration of the image of God: in a word, the full accomplishment in human life *in the flesh* of all those designs for which the *mystery of godliness* was *manifest in the flesh.* Gal. ii. 20. 1 Tim. iii. 16

34. From such a state as this can there be a fall?

Yes: since it is not a deliverance from infirmity and temptation and many of the consequences of that original sin of the race from which as his own inbred sin the believer may be saved. But this leads to the subject of the next chapter.

35. What answer may be given to every argument against this doctrine?

That of St. Peter: *Sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord.* If He be perfectly hallowed in the spirit within, He will perfectly hallow our *good manner of life in Christ* in the world without. Those who oppose this doctrine as PERFECTIONISM dishonour a word that pervades the New Testament. 1 Peter iii. 15, 16.

36. But is there no caution necessary as to the employment of the word by those who hold the true doctrine?

(1) It cannot be too carefully remembered that the word has a large variety of applications in the New Testament; and that therefore it ought not to be used without express reference to the sense in which it is used.

(2) As employed by the individual Christian concerning himself, it is a term more appropriate to his aspiration than his professed attainment.

(3) But this by no means throws doubt upon the possibility of that attainment.

CHAPTER V.

The Probation of the Gospel.

1. What is the subject suggested by this superscription?

The question as to the tenure on which the blessings of the Christian covenant are held.

2. On what leading terms does the subject rest?

On Assurance, Probation and Perseverance: as separate and in combination.

3. State the doctrine resulting from the combination of these terms?

That the blessings of the Christian covenant are conveyed to believers as in a probationary state: with full certitude of their possession while and as long as they are faithful to the conditions of their bestowment.

4. Does not the full meaning borne by either of the first two exclude that of the other?

Not if they are rightly understood. Assurance may indeed be interpreted in such a sense that the idea of a test in this life followed by approval in the judgment shall be shut out. And probation may be so exaggerated that any assurance this side of the judgment shall be hardly admitted. It is our duty to make each supplement and qualify and guard the other. Thus only do we reach the complete view of all.

5. May not the doctrine of final perseverance reconcile them?

Perseverance is a grace that belongs to probation; and as such it is encouraged by assurance. A gift of final perseverance is nowhere included in the covenant of grace.

6. Does the tenour of the New Testament combine assurance with probation in such a way as to justify this statement?

That can be seen only by examining the charter itself which the Holy Spirit administers.

7. Does not the Holy Spirit apply rather than administer the covenant?

No: the term apply does not aptly suit the way in which believers are made partakers of its provisions. The Spirit administers a covenant or testament which has been ratified once for all in the blood of Christ; and He does this according to terms, or on conditions, by which as the executant of the Lord's will He Himself is bound in the counsel of redemption. *He shall not speak from Himself.* John xvi. 13.

§ 1. Probation.

1. What is probation generally?

Moral trial issuing in a confirmed and fixed estate, either of approval or reprobation.

2. To what extent does this law of probationary test govern God's dealings with man?

We have seen that it lay at the foundation of the human history; and the whole of Scripture shows that it still continues, although under new and very peculiar conditions. In Paradise the probation was the trial of man's fidelity to the good; now it is the trial of his fidelity to grace working in his own nature to turn him from evil.

3. But did not the covenant of grace abolish probation?

(1) The very idea of covenant, as a method of Divine salvation, implies conditions on the part of man; and conditions imply probation. Though the conditions can be fulfilled only through grace, they are conditions still.

(2) That the Redeemer undertook and ensured the salvation of a portion of the race is not the doctrine of revelation, which represents mankind as having a new trial outside of

the garden. The Creator *made of one every nation of men . . . that they should seek God:* the whole of what follows in the apostle's discourse betokens a vast and universal probation.

Acts xvii. 26—31.

4. Is the word probation expressly employed in Scripture?

The idea underlies the term trial or test or temptation with all that belongs to it. (1) On the part of God we have such words as try or tempt, strive, command, forbear, promise, threaten, judge, punish, reward. (2) On the part of man, obedience, rebellion, choosing good or evil, tempting God, yielding to or vexing His Spirit, conscience, and self-judgment. All this is the vocabulary of probation: as appointed of God and as sustained by man.

5. How may we trace the lines of human probation?

(1) In the first appeals of mercy, which test the secret will as already under a preliminary grace, and speak to man as responsible: here is the profoundest secret of probation.

(2) In the process of life after acceptance or refusal of mercy; both being summed up in one sentence: *Try your own selves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Or know ye not as to your own selves, that Jesus Christ is in you? unless indeed ye be reprobate.* The only reprobation is the being tried and found wanting.

2 Cor. xiii. 5.

(3) The issues of the final judgment will be a severance between two characters formed in the present life.

6. What effect has the Gospel covenant on probation?

(1) As it respects the whole race our faith trusts in the PHILANTHROPY of God, *His love toward man:* grace now reigns over the world and will judge it in perfect righteousness. All nations have had and still have their trial.

Titus iii. 4.

(2) Every man has secret help from that grace which is on his side. Not only after regeneration but before it also God is *for us:* a mysterious but most gracious and certain truth.

Rom. viii. 31.

(3) The Christian probation proper is conducted under the special influence of the indwelling Spirit, Who makes the

lot of the Christian one continual test of graces that are disciplined, strengthened, and brought to perfection by trial.

7. What is the sum?

That all men are in this life on their trial for eternity; that the test is now, not whether we will abstain from the tree, but whether we will eat it and live; and that grace reigns most impressively over the whole probation.

8. But is all left to the decision of the great day?

In one sense it is so; but meanwhile provision is made for present assurance that the probation is in process of being successfully conducted towards its final issues.

§ 2. Assurance.

1. What is the general testimony of the New Testament on this subject?

The Christian privilege is said to be that of the FULL ASSURANCE of faith, expressed in the spirit and language of CONFIDENCE or the liberty of boldness: correlative words.

2. How are these ideas connected?

The full assurance, or *fulness*, *of faith* (πληροφορία) is shewn in *boldness to enter into the holy place* (παρρησία). But this faith may be viewed as in respect to its present object known: then it is *the full assurance of understanding;* and it is shewn in *great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.* As it respects its future object it is the *full assurance of hope even to the end;* and is shewn in not casting away the present confidence in order that *we may have boldness, and not be ashamed before Him at His coming.*

Heb. x. 22, 19. Col. ii. 2. 1 Tim iii. 13. Heb. vi. 11. 1 John ii. 28.

3. How may we treat assurance theologically?

By regarding first its objective grounds and then its subjective experience.

4. What is meant by objective assurance?

Limited here to the blessings of personal salvation, it

refers to the external and standing pledges given by God for faith to rest upon.

5. Where are they to be found?

(1) Ultimately in the resurrection of Christ: *As concerning that He raised Him up from the dead . . . He hath spoken on this wise, I will give you the holy and sure blessings of David.* He *was raised for our justification.* (2) The Christian Church, with its means of grace, and sealing sacraments, is a permanent witness of the goodwill of heaven in the world. (3) Especially the word of God with its innumerable promises in the Divine standing assurance to man.

Acts xiii. 34. Rom. iv. 25.

6. To what extent is this outward assurance sufficient?

None who persistently trust in these great pledges shall perish; but it has pleased God to give a corresponding inward assurance: that *we may have a strong encouragement.*

Heb. vi. 18.

7. What is the strict relation between these?

All internal assurance is based upon the external; but the internal is distinct and direct; and in full Christian experience the two are to be combined.

8. Who is the agent of internal assurance?

The Holy Spirit, *Whom God hath given to them that obey Him,* to those who *were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.* This gift is in us the assuring seal: as to God that we are His; as to ourselves, that we know ourselves to be His.

Acts v. 32. Eph. i. 13.

9. How is He the assuring seal?

First of our union with Christ and interest in Him generally; and then of each special relation of our common privilege. All these, however, are generally united.

10. How of our salvation in Christ generally?

The first experience of faith is the access into *this grace wherein we stand* through the personal reception of the Gospel and the Saviour: of this generally the Spirit is the seal; the word comes *in the Holy Ghost, and in*

Rom. v. 2. 1 Thess. i. 5.

much assurance. No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit. 1 Cor. xii. 3

11. What is the assurance as it respects the particular privileges individually and distinctly?

(1) Of our acceptance as justified He is the witness: *There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and death.* Rom. viii. 1, 2. He speaks to the conscience the Lord's own and peculiar words, *Thy sins are forgiven.* For the Spirit's witness of pardon there is no text. Luke vii. 48.

(2) Of our sonship He is the witness: confirming the testimony of our regenerate spirit; *The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God.* Rom. viii. 16. Our *spirit of adoption* as SONS confirms our regenerate voice as CHILDREN. Rom. viii. 15. Hence we may read: *the Spirit of adoption.*

(3) Of our sanctification He is the silent seal by His indwelling: *Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise . . . unto the redemption of God's own possession.* Eph. i. 13, 14.

12. Are these distinct kinds of assurance?

So are they described in Scripture; but they all flow into the one common experience which is said to be this, *that we might know the things that are freely given to us by God.* 1 Cor. ii. 12.

13. What other characteristics of assurance may be named?

That it is the full interior persuasion of personal salvation through Christ and in Christ; that in it there is to faith a supernatural revelation of its present object; that it is wrought by the Holy Spirit in the soul on or after believing; that it is the common privilege of believers; that, not being, however, a condition of salvation, it is distinct from saving faith. These are several aspects which must be united and reconciled.

14. What is the soul's state in the absence of assurance?

It is shut up to the outward pledges of God, waiting for the internal evidence: faith as simple trust rests only on the word of God, and saves; assurance follows it and makes it perfect though not always immediately.

15. But is it not said that faith is itself the evidence of things not seen?

That is its perfection as the great regulator of life on the way to eternity. *Faith is the assurance of things hoped for*, or it is the giving *substance* to them, making them a reality to hope; it is *the proving of things not seen*, their internal demonstration to the soul by a supernatural revelation.

Heb. xi. 1.

16. Is it not very difficult to sever saving faith from assurance?

Hard as it is, the distinction must be made. Faith is necessarily assured that Christ is a Saviour; but its personal trust in Him may be in its simplicity a naked venture of the soul. *Blessed are they that have not seen, and have believed!*

John xx. 29.

17. Is not this the distinction between the assurance of faith and the assurance of hope?

No: the only distinction between these is as to the present possession and the eternal possession of the blessings of the covenant: faith is sure now, hope is sure for the future.

18. What is meant by calling this witness a direct one?

(1) We thereby distinguish it from the indirect witness which the Spirit bears in the external means of grace. He comes through them into personal contact with the spirit of the believer: to it, with it, and in it, working assurance.

(2) Also from the indirect testimony which He bears through the fruits of the new nature seen in the life.

19. Is this testimony of a changed heart and life called the Spirit's witness?

Generally it is called our own: *He that hath received His witness hath set his seal to this, that God is true.* It is the testimony of our own conscience, or moral consciousness of being in a state of grace: *If our heart condemn us not, we have boldness toward God. For our glorying is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in holiness and godly sincerity* . . . The apostle here uses,

John iii. 33.
1 John iii. 21.
2 Cor. i. 12.

for himself at least, the same word (καύχησις) which he uses when speaking of the Spirit's witness: *We glory in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, through Whom we have now received the reconciliation.* Rom. v. 11.

20. What is the general strain of the New Testament as to the universality of this privilege?

Everywhere it is said to be the common prerogative of the estate of grace: not one given to the advanced in godliness; nor one to be sought as a higher experience. St. Paul says, speaking as in the Mediatorial court: *Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; through Whom also we have had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand; and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.* Rom. v. 1, 2.

(2) In the temple we read of the same tranquil confidence of assurance: *Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter . . . let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.* Heb. x. 19—22. We ENTER into the same assured estate of grace: whether as righteousness or sanctification.

(3) But chiefly as children of God the witness is ours, interior and permanent and universal: *And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath the life.* 1 John v. 10, 11, 12. And of him who believes it is said that *he hath the witness in himself.*

21. What is the peculiarity of this last passage?

That it is the final testimony of Scripture to this assurance.

§ 3. Perseverance.

1. What place has this term in the Spirit's administration?

Strictly speaking, it belongs to the ethics of Christian life. But it is introduced here to signify that special grace which is pledged to the Christian in his probation.

2. What is the ground or source of this grace?

As administered by the Spirit, its ground is the sufficiency of the atoning provision of the Gospel; the intercession and

will of Christ; as in the believer's soul it is the Spirit's own effectual indwelling.

3. Do not these three, taken together, carry the whole doctrine of a necessary final perseverance?

They do so certainly as it respects faithful believers, who are πιστοί in both senses of the term: the *called and chosen and faithful.* These three are not simply correlative: they are progressive also.

Rev. xvii. 14.

4. How is our Lord's intercession specially related to this?

(1) He declares both His will, and His request, that His Father would *Keep them from the evil one* whom He regards as given Him for His own: *that which Thou hast given Me.* These words imply that, though given to Him, this possession needed a special protection and might be lost.

John xvii. 15, 24.

(2) After the ascension our Lord *maketh intercession for us.* Against every enemy that might *separate us from the love of Christ* He Himself intercedes; and the answer of His prayer is *grace to help us in time of need.* But we are exhorted to *receive not the grace of God in vain:* hence the effectual succour obtained is itself a testimony to our probationary state and conditional salvation.

Rom. viii. 26, 35. Heb. iv. 16 2 Cor. vi. 1.

(3) The gift of the indwelling Spirit is the fruit of our Lord's intercession: *Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise . . . unto the redemption of God's own possession:* εἰς, *unto,* however, is not here a link that cannot be broken.

Eph. i. 13, 14.

5. Can the Saviour's love to His own be baffled and disappointed?

He Himself says: *If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered.* And it is hard to interpret His lamentation over Judas as other than an acknowledgment that he was reprobate, that is, rejected after probation: *Not one of them perished, but the son of perdition.*

John xv. 6. John xvii. 12.

6. Can the Spirit's power be baffled in the human spirit?

We read that He may be grieved, quenched, lusted against: stages of resistance. That He may be finally over-

come by persistent obstinacy is never denied, and in some passages very plainly suggested: as in St. Jude's words to fallen Christians *having not the Spirit.* Eph. iv. 30. 1 Thess. v. 19. Gal. v. 17. Jude 19.

7. What Scriptural argument is there for a conditional guarantee of final salvation?

The whole current of exhortation, of which one typical example may be given. The Word of God thus warns: *Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any one of you an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the living God; but exhort one another day by day, so long as it is called To-day; lest any of you be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin: for we are become partakers of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end.* The IF is emphatic. Heb. iii. 12—14.

8. How is this typical?

(1) It expressly makes the rejection of individuals, while the nation as a whole was saved, a warning example to Christians: the body of Christ is absolutely secure, but individual salvation is viewed as probationary.

(2) It deeply impresses the TO-DAY of probation.

(3) It speaks of a falling away from the living God: this is the death of a soul that had lived in God.

(4) It describes sin in its result of hardening or reprobation.

(5) It expressly declares that union with Christ eternally requires that the confidence of assurance be held firm to the end.

Thus all the elements of our doctrine—probation, assurance, and conditional perseverance—have their strongest expression in this passage, the type of many others.

9. But is there not a glorious host of passages which run in another strain?

Yes, in both Testaments; and they must not be despoiled of their meaning in the interests of any doctrine.

10. How are these opposite strains to be reconciled?

By remembering the following points:

(1) That the whole church *perfected into one* is always present in revelation, as already saved in the Divine purpose. John xvii. 23.

(2) That one part of the testimonies regards the accomplishment as already foreknown of God; while the other addresses us as working out our salvation. As to the former: *Whom He foreknew, He also foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son. . . . And whom He foreordained, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified.* As to the former, there is a corresponding chain of virtues in which we are bidden to give all diligence to make our *calling and election sure; for if ye do these things ye shall never stumble.* St. Paul and St. Peter must here be harmonised.

Rom. viii. 29, 30.

2 Peter i. 10.

(3) That the mystery of the reconciliation is beyond our faculties; but altogether within the range of our practical duty.

§ 4. Historical.

1. What are the relations of historical theology to the leading terms of this chapter?

They have been bound up together under two very different aspects: varied according to the views held as to the nature of the covenant of grace in Christ.

2. Distinguish these two.

(1) According to one, the covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son as Mediator and the Holy Spirit as Administrator guaranteed the salvation of a certain number of the descendants of Adam: on this principle probation loses its full meaning, assurance when reached is the certitude of salvation, and perseverance is guaranteed as final.

(2) According to the other, the covenant is with Christ as the Saviour of the race; and, inasmuch as the entire race is not saved, the probation of all is the test of each, assurance is only of present salvation, and perseverance is a grace or virtue of religion on which final acceptance depends, humanly speaking, as a condition.

3. Which of these views had the precedence in Christian history?

The latter. Before the time of Augustine the former, ■■

we have seen, had no clear expression. Since the time of Augustine, but especially since the revival of Predestinarianism by Calvin, and most especially the Federal Theology that sprang out of his system, the two views of the Christian covenant have ruled and divided theological opinion on these subjects. The controversy, however, becomes gradually fainter.

4. Do Predestinarians base their views of probation, assurance, and perseverance, entirely on the immutability of the covenant of redemption?

That is their stronghold; by the light of their conviction on this subject they interpret all Scripture. Some passages give them support; and others, which fail them, they bend into submission or resign for future light.

5. But is not the Absolute Sovereignty of God their final refuge?

It may be said to be so, though many shrink from the term. The will of God, of which He gives no account, is supposed to have been represented by the Father, Whose counsel the Son covenanted to fulfil, having a portion of mankind given to Him of the Father as His reward. The Holy Spirit enters into the covenant as its future Administrator on behalf both of the Father and of the Son. This covenant being granted, or taken for granted, the final perseverance of the saints needs no other proof: the Scriptures must be, they ought to be, harmonised with it.

6. Where is the supposed Scriptural ground of this?

Here again the Predestinarian acceptation of the Gospel does not rely so much upon specific texts as upon the entire history and mystery of redemption, which is regarded as the actual deliverance of those whose place the Redeemer took by vicarious substitution, suffering in their stead the penalty and curse of the law and in their stead honouring that law by obedience. The mind once possessed by that thought finds that the word of revelation possesses it everywhere.

7. But are there no special passages?

The Saviour's words are quoted: *All that which the*

Father giveth Me shall come unto Me. But He adds: *Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto Me;* and, moreover, He mourns over one of those given to Him as having *perished*, as *the son of perdition.*

John vi. 37. John vi. 45. John xvii. 12.

8. Is there no more direct answer?

Yes; all the passages which speak of the Saviour's heritage and possession refer to the portion of mankind who are foreseen as saved: whose salvation is now a present reality to Omniscience: but without any necessary reference to a predestinating decree.

9. How does this view of the eternal covenant affect the doctrine of probation particularly?

The redeemed of the Lord are not saved in the way of probation. The first Adam's probation having been a failure, under the supposed covenant of works, the second Adam took the probation on Himself and became the Surety for His own: the test was really His, not theirs.

10. But does not this system allow any probation for the saints?

Yes; their own works are proved and found wanting and rejected or reprobate, in the sight of God and in their own sight; and, further, the issue of probation may in their case determine their relative place in the rewards of glory.

11. Is this doing justice to the system?

Not quite: its whole economy of probation is maintained on the ground that the saints are predestined to the means as well as to the end. Moreover, the conditions on which we lay so much stress are said by its defenders to be the very gifts of the charter themselves. Repentance and faith, for instance, are certainly conditions; but grace alone gives them in and with and after the new birth.

12. How does it affect particularly the doctrine of assurance?

It lays the main stress on the objective assurance of the stability of the covenant of redemption. Personal subjective

assurance is a special grace, to be sought and found; but, when received, it is an assurance for ever.

13. What may be said of this?

That, on the one hand, it limits unduly a blessing which is made in the New Testament a common privilege; while, on the other hand, it unduly enlarges that privilege, making it include confidence of final perseverance.

14. Then, as to final perseverance, what is its precise doctrine?

That none for whom Christ died can perish: they being not only ordained to eternal life but also to that way of watchfulness and diligence in probation which leads to it.

15. Is this latter point essential to predestinarianism?

It is much used in argument, and still more in the earnest lives of those who use it; but it is not essential, for Christ has *obtained eternal redemption.* He who has built on the foundation may see all his superstructure burnt, but he *himself shall be saved; yet so as through fire.* He is *ordained to eternal life:* concerning which our Saviour said, *I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish.*

Heb. ix. 12.
1 Cor. iii. 15.
Acts xiii. 48.
John x. 28.

16. Can this quaternion of texts be withstood?

No; they are the everlasting sheetanchor, *entering into that which is within the veil,* for all who *continue in the faith, grounded and stedfast, and not moved away from the hope of the gospel.* But they may be dangerously perverted.

Heb. vi. 19.
Col. i. 23.

(1) With regard to the first, the eternal redemption is not in any way limited: nor can it be, for St. John, speaking expressly of the Advocate for His people as possibly sinning, adds that *He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world.*

1 John ii. 1, 2.

(2) As to the second, St. Paul is speaking of false teachers who erect on the one foundation a perishable superstructure.

(3) The τεταγμένοι to eternal life are those then disposed or set in order for it. Foreordination or predestination to life is not a scriptural idea: we are foreordained only *to be con-*

formed to the image of His Son; and that not in the future only, though then preeminently.

Rom. viii. 29.

(4) Our Saviour adds: *No one shall pluck them out of My hand.* He does not say that they may not leave Him and no more follow Him. Nor could He: for, in His only other allegory, that of the vine, which is the pendant of that of the sheep, He says: *If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered.* John x. and xv. must not be divided.

John x. 28. John vi. 66. John xv. 6.

17. On what other texts does this theory of the gospel rely?

Three classes may be mentioned, which have reference to the three estates of justification, regeneration and sanctification respectively.

(1) As to an eternal and necessary justification: *And whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified.*

Rom. viii. 30.

(2) As to a new life never to be forfeited: *Having been begotten, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible.*

1 Pet. i. 23.

(3) As to an inviolable sanctification to God: *By which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.*

Heb. x. 10.

18. How may the evidence of these be resisted?

There is no need to resist them: they are the strength of religion. They are the glorious things spoken of the church; and belong to every one who is faithful. The justification of the first passage, however, is after all only one link in a chain of events looked back upon as from the fixed future. The indestructible life is such in contrast with all the glory of the flesh: it is nowhere said that the living may not become twice dead. The eternal sanctification is the lot of *the holy*, who are to be *made holy yet more.* The *once for all* refers to the offering of the Lord's Body and not to its virtue in us.

1 Pet. i. 24. Jude 12. Rev. xxii. 11. Heb. x. 10.

19. But is not the true view of our present trilogy of doctrines concerned with other systems than the predestinarian?

Undoubtedly: the truth of probation is a test of almost every Christian theory.

20. How, for instance, does it affect sacramentarianism?

That system, fully developed, tends in no small degree to lighten the sacred burden of personal responsibility; and, in every form, its danger is that of diminishing the sense of the unspeakable solemnity of probation.

21. Is there no opposite danger?

That of those who refuse the doctrine of assurance, and decry it as fanaticism: making the whole religious discipline of life a fearful looking for of final decision. *We through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith:* this is for cautionary use on one side. *Rejoice in the Lord alway:* this is the tranquillising counterpart on the other. Gal. v. 5. Phil. iv. 4.

22. How does our doctrine bear on theories of the future?

(1) The true view of probation, embracing all its meaning, is inconsistent with any moral test in the intermediate estate: though the day of judgment is its limit, it is such only as making finally manifest the issues of a probation in time: *It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this judgment.* Heb. ix. 37.

(2) The annihilation of the reprobate might be harmonised with one meaning of reprobation; but not with the full significance of a judgment in which *each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done.* 2 Cor. v. 10.

(3) Universal restoration is not consistent with our doctrine: as probation would on any interpretation of that bold theory be overpowered by a grace omnipotent.

23. But what is the theological error which the teaching of scripture most firmly opposes?

Antinomianism, theoretical and practical.

24. And how does our doctrine effectually oppose it?

By enforcing Christian Morals as the Ethics of Redemption.

Chapter VI.

Christian Morals; or the Ethics of Redemption.

1. What do we understand by Christian morals?

The conduct of life according to the principles contained in the gospel of Jesus Christ, Who, as the Incarnate Son of God, is the Supreme Lawgiver.

2. Why is this subject introduced under the Holy Spirit's administration?

Because the new moral life springs out of that estate of grace into which the Holy Spirit introduces believers. We have seen what that estate is, and its probationary character: it remains that we consider what the new life is, as the fruit of redemption, and how in it the Christian probation is regulated and successfully accomplished.

3. Is this what is meant by the second title, the Ethics of Redemption?

Ethics and morals are terms derived from the Greek ἔθος, and Latin *mos*, to designate the moral or ethical habit. But their connection with redemption implies two things: (1) they are the new life as based upon the fundamental principles of our redemption generally in Christ; and (2) they are the new life as springing from that redemption personally experienced.

4. But do we not thus unduly limit the field of morals?

By no means: for (1) redemption is universal in its effect on mankind, and therefore morals in their widest range may be connected with it; and (2) personal redemption prepares those who receive it to exhibit morality in all its departments, leaving none of them unguided by precepts.

5. How may the subject, thus viewed, be unfolded?

By first considering the specific principles of the Christian moral system. After this we may take up the application of these principles in relation to personal character, and in relation to the community of Christian life: that is, Applied Ethics.

I.

The Principles of Christian Ethics as such.

1. What are our main subjects here?

First, we are bound by our loyalty to pay homage to the New Lawgiver; then we may study His legislation in relation to moral philosophy as a science; and lastly, mark the new principles of Christian law as based on the gospel.

2. But is there not a preliminary difficulty in the word New, in relation to eternal and unchangeable morality?

Not when rightly understood. The word new is a relative one, and has three meanings in theology: it is here the consummation of the old; it is a beginning as having all the force of a higher revelation; and it is the beginning of a better order. In all these senses the Christian legislation is new.

§ 1. Jesus Christ the Lawgiver.

1. What is the full meaning of the term lawgiver?

It has two senses. First and chiefly, that of a supreme authority in imposing moral law: *There is one lawgiver.* Jas. iv. 12. Subordinately, that of a delegate or minister appointed to deliver and set in order the various ordinances of that supreme Lawgiver: *Did not Moses give you the law?* John vii. 19.

2. In which sense is our Lord the lawgiver?

In both. As the Eternal Son, He has Divine authority: *that all may honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.* John v. 23. As the Incarnate Lord, He is set *as a* Heb. iii. 6.

Son over His own house with a delegated supremacy. In both, as united, He is the fountain of law: *Hear ye Him!*

Matt xvii. 5.

3. Do we note any distinction between these in the New Testament?

It is the characteristic teaching both of the Gospels and of the Epistles that in His undivided Person the Lord Christ is the final authority. They do not ask in what sense.

4. But is there not a special relation between the Lord's supremacy in morals and His mediatorial work?

Undoubtedly there is; as the doctrine of the three offices has shown. (1) As to us: by His atoning death the condemnation of the law has been removed, and the Spirit obtained for our new obedience. (2) As to Himself: He acquired, as God-man, supreme authority over the redeemed world, which He has made His own kingdom.

5. Is He not, however, presented to us as setting an example of obedience?

Yes: but in this matter we must carefully distinguish.

(1) The Son was made *under the law*, as He was made *a curse for us* and was made *flesh*: being in these three respects still essentially Divine. It was God who became flesh, the Blessed One who bore the curse, and the Lawgiver above law who *learned obedience*: that is, who learned, not to obey, but what His suffering obedience meant and required.

Gal. iv. 4. Gal. iii. 13 John i. 14. Heb. v. 8.

(2) His example was that of perfect love to God and man: shown in His absolute self-sacrifice, to which indeed His character as exemplary is generally limited throughout the New Testament. But it must be remembered that He is the supreme model (ὑπόδειγμα) of our aspiration, rather than the example of our religion in detail: a perfect EXEMPLAR rather than a perfect EXAMPLE.

John xiii. 15.

6. What were the characteristics of our Lord's legislation?

It must be viewed in respect of the moral law generally, and particularly of that form of the law which already existed among the Jewish people.

7. How did He treat the Jewish law?

He honoured it at all points as being Himself a minister of the circumcision. But in honouring it He dissolved it as it was a ceremonial law, fulfilled in Himself the great reality: this however was clearly seen only after Pentecost. The political laws of the old theocracy were silently changed into the laws of the new kingdom of heaven. Of the moral law, as running through the Mosaic legislation, and summed up in the decalogue, He specially said: *I came not to destroy, but to fulfil.* Matt. v. 17.

8. What was His relation to moral law generally?

He came to restore man to obedience, *The end of the law unto righteousness.* This may be said to have been the ultimate design of His whole work. Hence His doctrine is the foundation of ethics: the particular doctrines of the faith are all bound up with morals; and morals or godliness are their crown and end. Rom. x. 4.

§ 2. The Christian Law and Ethical Science.

1. What is to be understood by ethical science and moral philosophy?

That branch of knowledge which is concerned with human nature as morally constituted: that is, as amenable to the law of right and wrong.

2. How is Christian morality related to this?

Precisely as natural theology is related to supernatural revelation. The ethical science of Christianity acknowledges and builds on the fundamental principles of natural ethics; but its peculiar doctrines give them new applications, running through the whole course of morals.

3. Is there merely an analogy between the two?

More than that; for they are essentially one: the natural religion of the world was the foundation of its moral philosophy before the coming of Christ; and, since then, the case has been very much the same.

4. What are the fundamental principles of ethical science which the Christian legislation accepts?

All those which are really fundamental: such, namely, as are expressed in the universal language of mankind as belonging to the ideas of Duty, Virtue and the Chief Good.

5. How does Christianity treat the first ethical idea, that of duty?

The idea of duty—expressed by the terms obligation, right and wrong, conscience, ought and must, law, judgment, reward, and punishment — remains unaltered; but Christianity, or rather revelation, alone gives the ground of moral obligation.

6. How is this to be established?

The science of ethics, as independent, has been what its theories on this subject have made it. One theory finds the ground of morals, or that which makes good to be good, in the fitness of things: a vague and unmeaning notion. Another in the idea of right, which begs the question; another in the subjective moral sense of mankind, which denies an immutable standard; another in the idea of benevolence or the good of the whole, which is Utilitarianism, under many forms; another in the general principle of evolution, which neither fears God in His authority nor regards man in his dignity. Christianity rises above all these.

7. What then is its teaching?

That man, created in the image of God, has the ground of obligation as a creature in the Divine nature, and as a moral agent in the Divine will.

8. How does Christianity here supplement the deficiencies of ethical science?

By its three doctrines of the fall, redemption and eternal judgment: the first explaining how man knows a duty which he cannot fulfil; the second how he may both know it and fulfil it; and the third what the issues of his responsibility are.

9. How does it deal with the second ethical idea, of virtue?

By accepting here also the entire vocabulary: for instance, as seen in the ancient and universal cardinal virtues, formed into habits, of wisdom, temperance, courage, and justice. But it imports the true grounds and principles of virtue and glorifies it in every sphere.

10. How is this to be seen?

In many ways. The noblest conception of virtue, apart from revelation, was the Stoic subjection of sense to reason: Christianity makes it the ascendency of the Holy Spirit conforming the whole man to the holiness of God. The four cardinal virtues have become the three theological graces of faith, hope, and charity. The standard of virtue is the perfection of human nature as seen in the Son of God. And the virtues which ethical science describes as unattainable Christianity brings within human reach.

11. And how is the third idea treated, that of the summun bonum or chief good?

The best definition in ethical science—from Aristotle to Kant—Christianity accepts: It is that which is sought as an end in itself and not as means to an end. But the chief good of man is shown to be not happiness but blessedness: BLESSEDNESS IN GOD.

12. In what other respects do Christian ethics correct the natural systems?

(1) By treating the subject as more than merely psychological: that is, not simply a study of the make and constitution of the human soul as it now is. Many of the best moral systems have erred by studying the phenomena of human nature in themselves and too exclusively.

(2) By limiting it to its proper object: the moral relations of man. Ancient and modern ethical systems have gone on the principle that the whole sum of human interest and duties must be included. Æsthetics, jurisprudence, social science, politics, are here only indirectly concerned.

(3) By making the entire science hang upon Christian doctrine; and teaching all morals in their connection with redemption: thus introducing a totally new vocabulary as well as enlarging the meaning of almost every word in the old.

(4) Lastly, by taking the subject out of the sphere of philosophy, which is the pursuit of wisdom, and making it the practical directory of the new life in Christ.

§ 3. The New Principles of Christian Morality.

1. What is meant by these fundamental principles?

They are certain leading characteristics which are brough into prominence by the Christian legislation.

2. Only brought into prominence?

It can hardly be said that any of them are positively new; but, though they are latent in other legislation, only in this are they made supreme.

3. Which are these principles?

They might be summed up in one word, LOVE, as itself the summary of all law and all fulfilment of law. But it will be well to resolve this into three ideas, given us by our Lord Himself and His servants: the unity of the law as love; the spirituality of its interpretation; and the liberty of its obedience.

Love and Law.

4. How has our Lord connected love and law?

(1) By making all duty, that is, the whole of practical religion, one in the love of God. This precept, found in the law, He for the first time stamped as the GREAT AND FIRST COMMANDMENT. Deut. vi. 5.

(2) By combining with this *a second like unto it*, which He for the first time declared to contain all duty to man: *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.* Matt. xxii. 38, 39.

(3) Thus making all true self-love and love of the neighbour one; and placing that unity in the love of God which

must be *from all thy heart, and from all thy soul, and from all thy mind, and from all thy strength.* All other love must be part of the love of God and flow from it. Mark xii. 30.

5. Was not this in the old legislation?

The precepts were there, but not as combined; and not as the compendium of all duty: *in these two commandments hangeth the whole law, and the prophets* (not only ἐκ but ἐν). Matt. xxii. 40.

6. What effect had this on later teaching?

The hour when our Lord thus spoke was the most glorious crisis in morals; and its influence is felt throughout the New Testament: every one of our Lord's teachers pays his tribute to love as the unity of all obligation.

7. How does St. Paul pay his tribute?

(1) *The end of the charge is charity*, even as *Christ is the end of the law.* 1 Tim. i. 5. Rom. x. 4.

(2) In his hymn to charity he shows that all religion is love: negatively, without it *I am nothing*, and positively, *the greatest of these is love.* 1 Cor. xiii. 2, 13.

(3) With special reference to the neighbour, he says, *love, therefore, is the fulfilment of law*, and *the bond of perfectness.* Rom. xiii. 10. Col. iii. 14.

8. And how St. Peter?

Not so expressly. But as he makes faith the beginning or ἀρχή, so he makes love the end or τέλος *charity* of religion: *and to love of the brethren, charity* or LOVE. 2 Pet. i. 7.

9. What is St. James's testimony?

He calls love *the royal law:* with reference, however, to the Lord's second commandment, concerning which he adds, *If ye fulfil it ye do well* (τελεῖτε, a great word). Jas. ii. 8.

10. And how does St. John crown the whole?

He alone absolutely makes all religion love: not, as the others, referring it to the neighbour: *God is love; and he that abideth in love abideth in God*, and *God abideth in him. Perfect love casteth out fear.* 1 John iv. 16–18.

11. Does all this mean that love is substituted for law?

By no means: summing up is not absorbing or annihilating.

12. In what other sense is love the unity of the law?

In that it is the fulfiller as well as the fulfilment.

13. How is it the fulfiller?

(1) It is the strongest principle of our nature: as re-
Gal. v. 6. generate it *worketh through love.*

(2) As delight in God and gratitude for redemption, it is
1 John iv. 19. the response of God's love: *We love because He first loved us.*

(3) It is the guardian of the law: jealous of its honour.
Ps. cxix. 97. *O how love I Thy law!*

(4) It is the expositor of law where it does not speak in
Phil. i. 9. precepts: abounding *in knowledge and all discernment.*

Matt. xxvi. 10. (5) It is the infallible arbiter in cases of casuistry. *She hath wrought a good work upon Me.*

14. What effect on Christian ethics has this whole doctrine?

If love is the unity of law and fulfilment, then (1) we need not fall short of obedience, and (2) we cannot go beyond
Rom. xiii. 9. it in works of supererogation. Both these are established by *If there be any other commandment*, rightly understood.

Spirituality of Interpretation.

15. What may we understand by this generally?

As to the law itself, that all its precepts have an application wider than the letter; and as to the performer, that obedience lies in the intention.

16. How has the Lord given prominence to this?

Throughout His teaching; but especially in the sermon on the mount. In the first part of it the spiritual meaning is brought out: as, for instance, that the prohibition of murder
Matt. v. 22. and adultery extends to every form of anger and lust.
Matt. vi. 22. In the second part, the single eye is explained and illustrated. The breadth of the law and the obedience of the heart are the two leading ideas of the whole discourse.

17. Can the spiritual interpretation be called a new principle of the Christian legislation?

By no means. The best heathen morality laid stress upon it. The Mosaic legislation used the very words which have been quoted as giving the characteristic of Christianity: *And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart.* And again: *The word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it.* Deut. xxx. 6, 14.

18. Did not these passages point onward to the gospel?

Yes; but they had their application on the way. The ethics of psalmist and prophet are in the highest strain of spirituality: *Thy commandment is exceeding broad! Thy word have I hid in mine heart!* Ps. cxix. 96, 11.

19. What means then the preeminence of the gospel as a ministration of the Spirit?

Undoubtedly it was the characteristic of the old covenant that its legislation was a *ministration of death, written and engraven on stones*, and *of the letter;* while the new covenant is a *ministration of the Spirit.* The latter brings the spiritual meaning in Christ of the typical letter in Moses; and also the spiritual power of the Holy Ghost, from which alone the true obedience can flow. 2 Cor. iii. 7, 6.

20. What form does the principle take in the later New Testament?

It is more closely linked with the fully developed doctrines of regeneration and the indwelling Spirit. The law is regarded as spoken TO the spiritual inner man: *he that is spiritual judgeth all things.* It is written ON *their heart.* And it is obeyed FROM *the heart.* 1 Cor. ii. 15. Heb. viii. 10. Rom. vi. 17.

21. How then may we state the application of this principle in Christian legislation?

(1) In the interpretation of the moral code of the Old Testament generally and of the decalogue in particular: every

one of the ten words of which must have a large and spiritual meaning put into its letter.

(2) In the interpretation of the Lord's own precepts: for instance, in those which were designed for a transitional state, such as *Sell all thou hast!* Luke xviii. 22.

(3) In the application of every precept universally, which, as it has a letter, so must have a much wider meaning than the letter.

22. What has to be guarded against here?

(1) That the letter never be forgotten, while the spiritual meaning is observed; (2) that the spiritual meaning never be forgotten, while the letter is observed.

Liberty and Law.

23. What is the relation of these two terms?

Taken together, they express the great truth which Christian legislation first taught, that perfect obedience is perfect freedom.

24. As to the law itself, or obedience to the law?

As to the latter first and chiefly: perfect obedience is unconsciousness of law, which is lost in love.

25. How can that be?

The supreme proof is the supreme illustration: our Lord's perfect love to God and man was expressed in the MUST of a most perfect obedience: *I must be about My Father's business.* But absolute necessity in Him was absolute freedom. Luke ii. 49.

26. As our ethical Master does He apply this to us?

He graciously promises to make us partakers of His own liberty: *If therefore the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.* Again: *If a man love Me, he will keep My word.* And, *If ye are led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law.* John viii. 36. John xiv. 23. Gal. v. 18.

27. How does the term liberty apply to the law itself as external?

That is a more difficult question; and one that must be carefully handled, so as to avoid opposite extremes.

28. Which are the two extremes?

One is what may be called Pharisaism; and the other Antinomianism: the best method of ascertaining what Christian liberty from law means is to consider it in relation to these.

29. What is the former?

We call it Pharisaism, because our Lord made the Pharisees its representatives. It may be termed legalism, or nomism; and means that religion is summed up, not in love but in obedience to external commandment.

30. What is Christian liberty, as protecting from this?

It rejoices in being no longer under the law as a law that condemns. And it rejoices in being under the influence of the Spirit of love in obeying its precepts.

31. What is the latter, Antinomianism?

As doctrinal, it holds that Christ has vicariously fulfilled the law as well as suffered its penalty: that therefore believers have nothing to do with law. As practical, it abuses its liberty to licentiousness. These are *the enemies of the cross of Christ.* Phil. iii. 18.

32. What is Christian liberty, as protecting from this?

Its watchword is the doctrine that the gospel is *the perfect law of liberty:* its perfection being that its liberty is *under law to Christ,* and that its law is the *royal law* of love. Jas. i. 25. 1 Cor. ix. 21. Jas. ii. 8.

33. Are there any other applications of the principle?

Yes, there are two: (1) As to things indifferent; (2) As to the voluntary imposition of laws on self. The Christian man is free to be a law unto himself in all these things.

§ 4. The Codification of Christian Ethics.

1. What is meant by this?

The consideration of the inquiry how far and in what way Christianity proposes a systematic body of moral rules: like those, for instance, of the levitical economy.

2. And how may the question be generally answered?

By saying that as there is One Lawgiver His methods have been one throughout revelation: Christian ethics are taught on the whole exactly as Jewish were.

3. Is this literally true?

(1) Jehovah in the Pentateuch uttered some eternal laws, and summed them up in the perfect love of Himself; Jehovah in the New Testament, our Lord, points to the decalogue as the way of life, making however that spiritual interpretation prominent which is really the interpretation of love.

(2) Statutes were given, at great length, referring to the theocracy; our Lord abolishes them, but only to substitute the laws of His kingdom: which are mainly, though not entirely, the precepts that regulate the fellowship of the church.

(3) As circumstances arise the ethics of both Testaments adapt themselves. We see the same gradually developed ethical system: from patriarchal to levitical and prophetical legislation in the Old; from Gospel to Acts and Epistles in the New. The analogy is almost perfect.

4. Is then the moral legislation and is the standard of morals in the Old Testament the same as that of the New?

Yes: allowance being made (1) for the great principles already referred to; and (2) for the special adaptation of many statutes *not good*—not permanently good—to the hardness of the people's hearts; and remembering further that (3) many actions recorded in the history of the ancients are simply recorded but not approved.

Ezek. xx. 25.

5. How does this affect the decalogue?

The decalogue—the TEN WORDS—was originally written on two tables of stone: it is now written *in fleshy tables of the heart.* Afterwards it was written in the Book; and there it still stands, the same in the New Testament as in the Old: being in neither, strictly speaking, the code of all duty. It is for ever the remembrancer of manifold obligation; but is insufficient as the basis of a Christian ethical system.

2 Cor. iii. 3.

6 What traces of system are to be found?

According to a wide variety of principles ethics are introduced. Besides the indications already given, we may note:

(1) The Saviour's discourses contain the inexhaustible materials of an orderly system of human duties.

(2) The apostles connect with the exhibition of every doctrine its practical and moral aspect: thus the arrangement of their doctrinal system is the arrangement of their ethics.

(3) Every epistle has its ethical section: mostly in strict order, as may be seen at the close of that to the Romans; but sometimes the practical application is interwoven throughout.

(4) Each writer without exception has his own method of summarising the essentials of ethics: either arraying the contrasted vices and virtues, the fruits of the flesh and the fruit of the Spirit; or presenting surveys of morals demanded in every relation of life; or drawing consummate pictures of universal moral excellence.

II.

Applied Ethics.

1. What is signified by this term?

The systematic arrangement of Christian morals as they are the application to life of the principles already laid down.

2. What law should govern the arrangement?

That which best shows the perfect symmetry and completeness of the Christian system. This cannot be done by enumerating the several virtues of religion as contrasted with the opposite vices; nor by simply taking the various relations in which man stands to other beings and objects. Christianity may be regarded as an ethical discipline tending to form a personal character in harmony with the estate of grace: this should be our first department. It may be regarded also as sanctifying all relations: this should be the second.

3. Can these be kept entirely distinct?

They necessarily blend with each other: the individual

character is formed amidst Christian relations; and Christian relations are moulded by personal character. But it will be found that the distinction can be fairly maintained.

I. Individual Ethics: or Personal Character.

1. Define strictly what is meant by this.

The influence of the gospel in the heart and life of every man who is brought under its full power as led by the Holy Spirit of regeneration and renewal.

2. How may this be reduced to system?

By bringing it into harmony with the Spirit's administration of the grace of the gospel. We have seen that there is an administration of preliminary grace leading to a state of salvation: the ethics of this do not here enter; they have been already treated. The estate of grace proper, as the new life of righteousness and sanctification, gives an obvious threefold distribution which is complete. In addition to these, the doctrine of probation in this life for the life to come introduces another class of ethical obligations consummating all.

3. Shall we not be going over again the old ground?

That is the danger of our method. But it must be remembered that we have to do now only with Christian duty as man's cooperation with the Holy Spirit; and that only in a brief analytical exposition.

§ 1. The Ethics of Righteousness.

1. How may these be generally viewed?

As comprising the graces and duties of universal obedience to the law of God.

2. Can we distinguish between the graces and the duties?

They are really one; but, regarded as duties, they may be discharged outwardly, and therefore are connected with relative ethics. It is the internal principle with which we now have more particularly to do: that is, the spirit of obedience and fidelity, forming a righteous character.

3. How may the spirit of obedience be viewed?

As active and passive: obedience and resignation.

(1) To the former belong the doing God's will, which is called also doing righteousness. It is the habit of surrendering the will, honouring the letter and spirit of law, and by Divine grace obeying every known command at all costs. 1 John iii. 7.

(2) To the latter resignation to the Divine dispensations, which are His will expressed in act; surrender to the guidance of God; and submission to His will in special tribulations.

4. What is the special dignity of this grace?

Beyond every other it may be said to sum up all religion. It was the ideal of the best systems outside of revelation, especially in the East, where however it degenerated into fatalism. It was the leading feature of religion in the Old Testament; and the first prayer of Christianity is *Thy will be done!* done by us, and on us, and in us. Matt. vi. 10.

5. What is its specifically Christian character?

The redeeming work of Christ is the ground of our righteousness before God; He Himself is the example and standard of our internal righteousness, *as He is righteous;* and all the obedience of righteousness is offered to Him as well as through Him: *Whatsoever I command you. Do all in the name of the Lord Jesus:* where ALL is emphatic. 1 Cor. i. 30. 1 John iii. 3—7. John xv. 14. Col. iii. 17.

6. And how may the spirit of fidelity be considered?

This the Christian duty as faithful discharge of a trust: a principle of personal ethics that extends over a wide and too much neglected range.

7. What are its various aspects in Christianity?

(1) Religion is regarded as fidelity in the general probation: Christians are οἱ πιστοί, believers or the faithful.

(2) Christ is a Master who assigns to every Christian a charge: generally over himself, and specifically over others in what is called in modern language a vocation.

(3) The whole conduct of religion is faithfulness in that which is least and that which is greatest. Lu. xvi. 10.

(4) Death is the surrender of the trust, and judgment the examination into our conduct in its discharge.

8. Is there a distinction between general and special vocation?

Vocation or calling is used only of the gospel generally; specific trusts are spoken of rather as stewardship.

9. How is the universal stewardship introduced?

We as servants are also stewards; and the stewardship includes our natural and acquired endowments. *Ye are not your own* extends to all: *Glorify God in your body*, suggests that our physical health is part of the charge. The parable of the unjust steward shows that wealth is; and the two parables, of the *ten pounds* distributed equally, and of the seven *talents* distributed unequally according to our *several ability*, extends the law to every kind of special endowment.

Luke xii. 42, 43. 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. Luke xvi. 9, 10, 13. Luke xix. 13. Matt. xxv. 15.

10. What are the ethics of stewardship?

(1) Fidelity in the spirit. Of the lowest of all stewards the apostle speaks as *shewing all good fidelity:* the only grace called good; and only on this occasion, till the *good and faithful servant* is praised by the Supreme Lord and Judge.

Titus ii. 10. Matt. xxv. 23.

(2) In the Christian stewardship singleness of eye: self being always subordinate to the Master's interest: *No servant can serve two masters.*

Luke xvi. 13.

(3) Conscientiousness: that is, anxiety to be *faithful in that which is least*, and training the conscience accordingly.

Luke xvi. 10.

11. What then is this training of the conscience?

The habit of so living as never to be conscious of neglecting what is right. *Herein do I also exercise myself to have a conscience void of offence:* not training himself to know the right, but always to do it; thus keeping the consciousness clear.

Acts xxiv. 16.

§ 2. The Ethics of Regeneration.

1. How may these be generally viewed?

As the duties required for the maintenance of the new

life; as the graces of that life to be cultivated; and as the obligations entailed by the conflict with the residue of evil, which, in the ethics of regeneration, is spiritual death.

2. Does the maintenance of the new life depend on any discharge of duty by the regenerate?

There are three ethical conditions to be noted:

(1) Union with Christ becomes abiding, not without our concurrence: *Abide in Me, and I in you!* is a precept. John xv. 4.

(2) The use of those means of grace which are the nourishment of the new life: prayer generally, but specially the hearing of the word, meditation on it, and communion with the Lord in the holy supper and in the whole of life.

(3) Those who LIVE *by the Spirit*, Who is *the Spirit of life*, are exhorted *by the Spirit* to WALK. Gal. v. 25. Rom. viii. 2.

3. What are the graces of the new life?

There is hardly a mark of religion which does not in a sense belong to these; but, specially viewed, the ethics of regeneration are simply and solely the character of Christ formed in the life and the means to that end.

4. How may this be ethically treated?

Passively, as the reflecting His image; actively as the imitation of His example.

5. Can the former be called a duty?

Christian ethics include the preparations of the heart and its intense desires for the perfect likeness of Jesus. We *are changed into the same image, even as from the Lord the Spirit;* but much of our religion consists in not thwarting or retarding, but promoting, the processes of this transformation. 2 Cor. iii. 18.

6. Under what aspect is the imitation of Jesus presented?

(1) The Lord's character is our standard and pattern, to which we are to aspire as Divine excellence in human form.

(2) But the processes and individual acts of our religious life have not their example in Him, *Who knew no sin.* 2 Cor. v. 21.

7. How are the graces of adoption shewn to the world?

By the maintenance of the dignity of the *children of God without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation:* the ethical principle which aims to walk worthy of our predestination *to be conformed to the image of His Son.*

Phil. ii. 15.
Rom. viii. 22.

8. What is the relation of filial ethics to the interior conflict?

A very important one: pervading the New Testament as the gradual victory of the regenerate nature over the remainder of sin. The conflict is between the old man and the new, between the flesh and the Spirit.

9. Can the more precise relation of these be given?

(1) In the former Christ is regarded as our life; and the ethics belong to our *fellowship* with His passion and resurrection. In the latter the Spirit of Christ is regarded as our life, and the ethics belong to our being *led by the Spirit.*

Phil. iii. 10, 11.
Gal. v. 18.

(2) Both shew that the sublime principle of Christian ethics is the conflict unto victory in union with our Head.

(3) The ethics of both are taught by St. Paul as the contrast of vices and virtues: the former as *the works of the flesh* which *they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified:* and the latter the living *fruit of the Spirit.* The two catalogues are a complete epitome of this class of ethics.

Gal. v. 19, 22.

10. What are the graces and duties pertaining to our fellowship with the cross?

Absolute and habitual self-denial, or renunciation of the self of sin. (1) The crucifixion of the flesh with its passive affection and active lusts; this whole self of the old man it is a Christian duty to hate and devote to death. (2) The mortification of self in individual tendencies to evil: *Mortify, therefore* (or, *make dead*) *your members which are upon the earth.* (3) Those who have once for all *put off the old man* have nevertheless to fight against the flesh not entirely destroyed.

Luke ix. 23.
Gal. v. 24.
Col. iii. 5.
Col. iii. 9.

11. What are the subordinate ethics that arise here?

The duty of religious self-discipline: Abstinence, fasting, self-examination, self-control, and the cultivation of spiritual-

mindedness, or the constant suppression of the carnal mind, by that special denial of it to which self-government prompts.

12. What is the speciality of this class of ethics?

They are entirely Christian: springing from union with Christ in His passion, and in His resurrection. All the best ethics of antiquity extolled self-control and the ascendency of the higher nature over the lower; but Christianity alone reveals the secret of the old man within us crucified, and the new man raised up to perfect life. This interior conflict is, in its relation to the cross and resurrection of Christ, a new revelation in ethics: it occupies a large place in the New Testament; and in the heart of every earnest Christian.

§ 5. The Ethics of Sanctification.

1. What is the range of this branch?

It includes the maintenance of the spirit of consecration and the renunciation of all that is inconsistent with it; the cultivation of the spirit of devotion and its exercise in all appropriate acts; the ceaseless pursuit of perfect union with God.

2. In what sense is consecration an ethical duty?

Religion begins with the presentation of self to God; it is our obligation to reckon ourselves with all that we have and are as His and not our own; renewing the dedication perpetually, and with deep solemnity at set times.

Rom. vi. 17. 13; xii. 1. 1 Cor. vi. 19.

3. What follows from this?

The principle that the ultimate intention of life must be to *glorify God*: which is a peculiarly Christian idea and the watchword of the ethics of sanctification. It is negative, the ordering every act in such a way that the honour of it may be the Lord's alone; and positive, so living that the glory of God's holiness may shine through us.

1 Cor. vi. 20. 1 Cor. x. 31. 1 Pet. iv. 11.

4. What is the renunciation required?

Supremely, that of sin and of self; subordinately, that of Satan and the world.

(1) Of sin; because holiness unto the Lord is separation from sin, viewed as impurity: *from all defilement of flesh and* 2 Cor. vii. 1. *spirit*, sensual and spiritual. Of self: the Christian 2 Cor. iv. 4. law does not allow self to be the final aim in any the least action of life.

Eph. ii. 2. (2) As Satan is *the god of this world*, this *present* Gal. i. 4. *evil world*, he is to be renounced, resisted, and defied. Jas. iv. 7.

5. Show the connection between sanctification and devotion.

The word devotion means dedication to another, that is to God; and as God is the object of worship always and in all things, devotion comes to signify the exercises of worship.

6. And what do these include?

As they pertain to personal duty, they mean that the heart is a temple in which God is sanctified: God, the Holy Trinity, in the Son. The spirit of reverence or awe, 1 Pet. iii. 15. of habitual practice of the presence of God, and occasional meditation on His perfections; habitual gratitude and occasional thanksgiving; habitual spirit of prayer and occasional acts of worship. Thus union with God, the highest privilege of the created spirit, is to be reached; or rather be for ever confirmed.

7. Does this exhaust the ethical range of sanctification?

That cannot be exhausted. There is no grace of the soul, no duty of life, which is not to be hallowed on the altar. The 1 John iv. 16. ethics of sanctification include the whole sum of life John iii. 21. and act as the soul *abideth in God* and its works are *wrought in God.*

§ 4. Ethics of the Probationary Estate.

1. What is the range of this class?

The duties and graces that connect time with eternity, this world with the next. Here we have opportunity to introduce every ethical principle or precept that has not been already mentioned as belonging to the personal character.

2. How may they be classified?

We have the duties arising (1) from our present peril; (2) from our grounds of confidence; (3) from a right estimate of the relation between this life and the next; (4) from the

responsibility of judgment; (5) and from the character required for admission to heaven.

3. What are the duties arising from our danger?

Of two classes, springing from one common principle of spiritual caution. (1) As to the internal peril, self-distrust, remembering that the heart is deceitful, impels to habitual self-examination, or the careful scrutiny of secret motives and secret tendencies to evil. As the danger is from without, this becomes watchfulness, which our Lord stamped with deep emphasis, *Watch and pray:* this being both wakefulness and caution. Matt. xxvi. 40. 1 Cor. xvi. 13. 1 Peter v. 8.

4. What are the ethics of confidence?

They are as prominent as the ethics of fear, and preserve them from excess.

(1) At their root is glorying or rejoicing in the Lord: the former objective, in Him; the latter subjective, in ourselves. 1 Cor. i. 31. Phil. iv. 4.

(2) A true estimate of our foes: of their strength, and of their weakness. This inspires that vigour and courage which the New Testament so much dwells upon. Eph. vi. 10–18. Jas. iv. 7. 1 Cor. xvi. 13.

(3) Decision of purpose (*purpose of heart*). This is the guard against undue scrupulosity, and the morbid fear of self which becomes despondency. Acts xi. 23. 1 Cor. ix. 26, 27.

(4) Hope, both as a virtue and as a duty, is found in universal ethics, but in Christianity shines resplendent. It is subjectively the active expectation of future good; and Christ is *our hope* objectively. It is a duty to *hope perfectly;* it is a grace, *the patience of hope;* and it *putteth not to shame.* Rom. viii. 24, 25. 1 Tim. i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 13. 1 Thess. i. 3. Rom. v. 5.

(5) Patience, which has two forms: endurance under pressure; persistence against difficulty. The latter includes patience with self; both are preservatives against undue fear. Rom. v. 3, 4; ii. 7.

5. How are the ethics of the relation between time and eternity treated?

They arise in great variety throughout the scriptures, but in the New Testament especially; appearing as principles of conduct, as positive duties, and as the highest graces.

(1) The habitual weighing eternity against time is laid down by our Lord as a fundamental regulative principle, even as the motive of all religion. And there is no ethical duty more pervasive than that of regarding life as a pilgrimage: on the one hand, contemning or not loving the world through which we pass, and, on the other, aiming at heaven as our true home and permanent commonwealth.

Luke ix. 25. 1 John ii. 15. Phil. iii. 20.

(2) The graces of religion to be cultivated accordingly are deadness to the present life and heavenly-mindedness. These are the constant aspiration and the noblest finish of the perfect Christian character.

Col. iii. 1, 2.

6. How are the ethics of future judgment to be viewed?

(1) They teach us to regard ourselves as forming a character which will then be *made manifest*. (2) They impose the duty of thinking, speaking, and acting, as those who have to give account of every act, word, and thought. (3) They bring that future reckoning into the habitual self-judgment of the present life.

2 Cor. v. 10. Jas. ii. 12.

7. How may we, finally, connect these ethics with those which have preceded?

The sum of all being the establishment of a perfect character, and this life being the sphere of probation for the next, it is plain that every other aspect of ethics must be viewed in the light of eternity.

II. Relative Ethics.

1. How is the relation of personal to relative ethics viewed in scripture?

Individual character and discharge of duty to others are always united: there is a constant mutual reaction; nor can we conceive any grace of interior religion which is entirely unrelated to external obligation.

2. What is the special aspect of this in Christianity?

It regards every man as a body of which Christ is the Head: and every man also as a member of the corporate body of which Christ is the Head. Hence

1 Cor. xi. 3. 2 Col. i. 18.

the word EDIFICATION (οἰκοδομή), or building up, is a new term which embraces all interior and exterior religion. 1 Cor. xiv. 4.

3. What distribution is suggested by the New Testament?

There is no ethical summary to guide us; but a careful examination will show that there are no applications of duty untouched. Relative ethics are viewed (1) as the bond of obligation to mankind as such; (2) as pervading family life; (3) as regulating common and social organisations generally; (4) more indirectly as affecting politics; and (5) lastly, as finding a special field in the community of the church.

§ 1. The Ethics of our Common Humanity.

1. How are these treated in Christian legislation?

In a larger and nobler spirit than in any other moral system. (1) In the highest outside of Christianity there was always either, as in the case of Judaism, some taint of exclusiveness in the feeling towards universal man, or, as in the case of Buddhism, a deep inferiority in the inspiring motive. (2) Christianity alone founds these catholic ethics on the unity of the race in the fall and in redemption.

2. What is the preeminence of the Christian law?

That it bases all duty to man as such on love and justice: the combination of which is the perfection of its teaching.

3. How is this seen?

Charity in him who performs the duty is the very love of God in man for man; and justice, regarding the object of the duty, recognises in that object an absolute claim to love.

4. How is love stamped as universal?

By our Lord's second commandment *like unto* the first; by His catholic interpretation of the neighbour, His own unlimited love being the standard of ours; by St. Peter's placing love beyond brotherly kindness; and by St. Paul's unique description of Divine love, the pattern of ours, as *philanthropy*, and as the *fulfilment of the law*. Matt. xxii. 39. 1 John iii. 16. 2 Pet. i. 7. Tit. iii. 4. Rom. xiii. 10.

5. What are the gradations of universal love?

It is benevolence as desiring, or beneficence as practising, good to all; it is self-sacrifice as the expression of unlimited love; and, passing through long-forbearance or magnanimity, mercy or pity or compassion, which regard the sin and misery of men, descends to the kindness and courtesy that make love pervade the ordinary intercourse of life.

6. What is universal justice?

It is the obligation to respect the rights of all men and
Rom. xiii. 7. in the widest sense to render *to all their dues.*

7. From what is it distinguished as universal?

(1) From the rectoral and distributive justice of God; (2) from the rectoral and distributive justice of human law.

8. What does it include as universal?

The rendering by man to man all human rights. Man has a right in himself, and justice forbids slavery; to his possessions, and it forbids both in spirit and act all robbery; to his character, and it protects him against positive slander and negative detraction; to his dignity as created in the
1 Pet. ii. 17. image of God, and it is justice that says *Honour all men.*

9. What is the sublime peculiarity of Christian ethics here?

That love and justice are interwoven in them. Love regards all its own offices as the right of all men; and is the liberal interpreter of those rights.

2. The Ethics of Family Life.

1. How are these treated generally?

The family is throughout scripture regarded as the foundation of all society; its ethics are in general the same in all dispensations; but Christianity has, in this as in every department, impressed its own peculiar character and elevated to perfection what had been imperfect.

2. What is the Christian meaning of the household?

Christianity is described both as the household or family

and as the temple of God: the two ideas blending. Hence Christians are the οἰκεῖοι (domestics) of God and of the faith. Eph. xi. 19. Gal. vi. 10. But, just as every Christian is a temple, while all are the temple, so, while all are the household, each family is such: under a master of the house, the members of which are husband, wife, children, master or mistress, servants (οἰκέται), slaves (δοῦλοι).

3. What is its obligation?

The same as in every age. The head of the house is held responsible for its worship of God, its soundness in faith, and its obedience to the Divine law: that is, for the maintenance of family religion, the master of the house, the father of the family, is held responsible. The head may be a woman: the noblest document of family religion is written to a widow. 2 John.

4. Is this the meaning of a church in the house?

Congregational religion and family religion are as a rule quite distinct. But under certain circumstances, as in the case of Philemon, a family might be assembled for ecclesiastical ordinances and be the same as a church. Philem. 2.

5. In what sense are they so distinct?

(1) Family religion is without the ministry, the sacraments, and the public assemblies, and the obligation to spread the gospel. (2) But the word of God and prayer it must have: this may be very simple, a lesson read and the Lord's Prayer; or it may be a very full service; but it should never be regarded as rendered needless or as superseded by the public worship of the congregation.

6. What are the Christian ethics of the estate of marriage?

(1) Our Lord has set His seal on monogamy as the original institution of the Creator. Mark x. 6.

(2) St. Paul gives the highest possible dignity to this estate by making it an emblem and illustration of the union betwixt *Christ and the church*, which is *the Lamb's wife*. Eph. v. 32. Rev. xxi. 9.

(3) Accordingly, the Christian man and wife are *joint-heirs of the grace of life;* their union is *undefiled* in itself; and must be kept undefiled. 1 Pet. iii. 7. Heb. xiii. 4.

(4) It is indissoluble in its nature; divorce is not permitted by the new legislation except for conjugal infidelity and desertion; and the forsaken wife should *remain unmarried.*

Mark x. 9. Matt. xix. 9. 1 Cor. vii. 15, 11.

7. What are the ethics of the parental and filial relations?

These are released from some rigorous enactments of the Jewish law, on the one hand; and, on the other, are, in common with all relations, but with special emphasis, elevated and hallowed *in the Lord.*

Eph. vi. 1.

(1) Parents are taught to regard their offspring as *holy*, that is, as by their birthright the Redeemer's property in a special sense, of which their baptism is the sign and seal; and to educate them in His *nurture and admonition.*

1 Cor. vii. 14. Eph. vi. 4.

(2) Children are taught to *obey their parents in all things*, and in due time to *requite their parents.* Here *in the Lord* derives special significance from the Lord's own perfect example in His twelfth year.

Col. iii. 20. Eph. vi. 1. 1 Tim. v. 4. Luke ii. 51.

§ 3. Social and Commercial and Political Ethics.

1. What is the range of these?

Strictly speaking, Christianity knows no social relations which are not bound up with the society of the church. Fellowship in art and science and numberless organisations of civilisation it indirectly sanctifies. But commerce it acknowledges as more directly a Divine institution; hallowing its principles, and taking them up into the general sanctification of life. The same may be said of civil and political society in all its departments and branches.

2. Is then the bearing of Christian ethics on all these only indirect?

It is indirect in this sense, that the Christian law is a leaven which gradually pervades all things, and the process of its influence is silent and secret. But, in proportion as Christianity obtains sway, and where it rules, the influence of its morals becomes direct and manifest. Meanwhile to the society of this world the highest teaching of Christianity remains and must ever remain an ideal

3. Give some illustrations of this.

(1) The relation of the church to the world, its fellowships and its ways of life, requires that the disciples of Jesus should carry religion everywhere: *in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation* being *blameless and harmless* and *seen as lights*. They are not permitted to *go out of the world*. Phil. ii. 15. 1 Cor. v. 10.

(2) Many social and political evils have been and are encountered by the indirect influence of Christian ethics: such as slavery, war, and some unbecoming public pastimes.

(3) There is no form of government which its influence has not indirectly penetrated: that influence which the apostles describe and recommend. Matt. xxii. 21. Rom. xiii.

4. What is meant by Christian ethics remaining as ideals?

Within the Christian church all the laws of Christ should be supreme: the sermon on the mount is the literal code; and accumulation of wealth, judicial or other swearing, retaliation in every form, must be excluded. But, until society is moulded by Christian law, it is hard to apply this standard. The Saviour and His apostles lived in a society which could not bear these precepts; and they conformed to the lower standard, for instance, in submitting to the oath.

5. Can this be proved or illustrated by nearer examples?

On the one side, St. Paul severely condemns having *lawsuits one with another*, especially as *before unbelievers*. But, on the other side, he himself appealed to Cæsar, and he had his Lord's sanction and authority for not refusing to plead before unbelievers. 1 Cor. vi. 6. Acts xxv. 11. Luke xii. 12.

6. How does this apply to the ethics of commerce?

Commerce is presupposed as one of the foundations of society. But it requires for its success and perfection a special application or accommodated interpretation of some of the precepts of Christianity.

7. For instance, the community of goods?

This was not obedience to a precept, but a special charisma, as it were, of the early church: the history of which flows on afterwards in the ordinary channels.

8. What is the strain of legislation on this subject?

It is generally defensive, warning against laying up treasure as such, and apart from the necessities of capital, or the due provision for the household. It also makes charity prominent: *To give to him that needeth.* How wide an application this admits may be seen in our Lord's parable of the Unjust Steward; in the hospitality of Gaius; and in the sanctification of Christian wealth in all ages. Nowhere, however, more impressively than in St. Paul's instruction to Timothy. There we have the warning side first, and then the encouraging side, of the possession of riches: in the one it seems almost impossible to be rich and a Christian; in the other riches are retained and made profitable in the Christian service; and thus the two passages are complementary.

Matt. vii. 19. Eph. iv. 28. Luke xvi. 2 John

1 Tim. vi. 9. 10, 17—19.

9. How does it apply to political society?

(1) Christianity in the clearest manner recognises that *the powers* THAT BE *are ordained of God*, because THERE IS *no power but of God.* Our Lord in a certain sense coordinates Divine and human authority: *Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's.* And His apostle also: *Fear God; honour the king.*

Rom. xiii. 1. Matt. xxii. 21. 1 Pet. ii. 17.

(2) Accordingly, the duty to pray for the government and its administration, to respect the laws, to pay tribute, and to live lives of peaceable citizenship, is everywhere inculcated.

1 Tim. ii. 1, 2. Rom. xiii. 1—7.

10. Is nothing further said as to the relations between the church and the state?

Nothing in precept and little in prophecy. New-Testament legislation is for Christians as members and subjects of the kingdom of Christ, which is *not of this world.* And the prophetic intimations, whether of the Old or of the New Testament, never suggest a blending of church and state.

John xviii. 36.

11. How then do they speak of it?

(1) In the ancient scripture, where church and state are one in the Theocracy, it is predicted that kings and

Isa. xlix. 23.

nations will bring their support and their treasures into the church of Christ, or that they will oppose it and be crushed. Isa. lx. 3—17.

(2) In the Apocalypse the alliance of temporal and spiritual power is foreannounced as one form of Antichrist; while in the same prophecy *the kingdom of the world is become of our Lord and His Christ.* Hagg. ii. 7. Ps. ii. 9. Rev. xiii. 4. Rev. xi. 15.

(3) But throughout the scripture it is assumed that Christianity must gradually mould every social and political constitution, while perfectly distinct from any of its forms.

12. How may we suppose this ideal realised?

By national acknowledgment of the Christian religion: as shown in legislative respect to the laws of Christ, in the maintenance of Christian principles in education, in public reverence for the name of God as the sanction of all authority, and in the protection of the Faith in its free and independent work.

13. How has the history of Christendom illustrated this?

By almost uniform failure to adjust rightly—whether in theory or in practice—the relations between the kingdoms of this world and the kingdom of Christ.

14. Where may we trace these failures?

Historically, throughout the corruptions of Christendom. In their principle, these have exhibited two general forms, with modifications, of the one error of confounding the two coordinate authorities. (1) Either the spiritual side of the power has been made supreme, as in Rome, and the secular made subordinate to it; or (2) the temporal power has patronised and directed the spiritual, as in the East and in Protestant Erastianism, whether Lutheran or Anglican. The true solution leads us to the doctrine of the Church.

CHAPTER VII.

The Christian Church.

1. Why is this subject introduced at this point?

Because the church is the sphere in which the Spirit administers all the offices of Christ. On this account it seems better to place it under the administration of redemption than to give it a too prominent and independent place.

2. What is the range of subjects here?

First we must study the foundation of the church, with its notes or attributes, as a body or corporate institution; then consider it as a temple or sphere of worship; and finally mark its relation to the world as preparing it for the final kingdom.

I.

The Church and its Notes.

§ 1. Its Foundation.

1. What evidence is furnished by the Gospels that our Lord purposed to found a fellowship or community?

The proofs of this take a threefold form.

(1) He spoke as come to set up *the kingdom of God*, or *the kingdom of heaven*, or *My kingdom*.

Matt. vii. 33; iii. 2.

(2) Twice He called it a church; first, in its universality, *I will build My church*, and then in its congregational character, *Tell it unto the church*.

John xviii. 36. Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 17.

(3) At the end of His ministry He ordained institutions which imply and require a permanent organisation.

2. When was the church actually founded?

On the day of Pentecost. (1) Then the kingdom came with power; (2) the church began as an ingathering

Matt. xvi. 28.

upon and around the name of Jesus ; and (3) the ministry and word and sacrament are first seen as united. Organisation commenced under the Holy Ghost, and flows on at once in the narrative.

3. What is the relation of kingdom and church ?

The kingdom refers rather to the authority of Christ its King ; the church, to the subjects of it gathered out of the word (ἐκ, καλέω) : as the ancient people lived under a Theocracy, so we under a Christocracy ; and as they were called the congregation, so we are called the church. The kingdom is one and always coming : the churches may be many in the one church, which is come.

§ 2. Its Notes or Attributes.

1. What is here meant by the notes of the church ?

Certain attributes which define it as the body of which Christ is the Head, and express its relation to time and eternity, to heaven and the world.

2. Does this imply that the church is Divine and human like its Head ?

The analogy is obvious, as it is His body ; but, like every other analogy, must not be pressed too far. Discreetly applied, it will be useful at every point of the study of the church, which has always two aspects, the heavenly and the earthly.

3. Which is the first note that illustrates this ?

The note of unity : in regard to this, the church is both one and manifold : its spiritual and heavenly oneness being essentially bound up with earthly diversity of forms.

4. What is the teaching of scripture as to the unity ?

(1) The body of saved mankind *out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation* is in a broad sense the one church. Rev. v. 9.

(2) The church of God is one under the several dispensations : the patriarchal, Jewish, Christian.

(3) But, more appropriately, the church of Christ is one in the confession of the *one Lord :* this being Eph. iv. 3–6.

the *one baptism* into the name of the Trinity which makes *one body;* and the possession of the Holy Ghost uniting with the Head, which makes the *one Spirit.*

Eph. iv. 3–6.

5. And what does it teach as to diversity?

(1) It speaks of churches distinct, though united in the common confession, worship, and discipline.

(2) It is silent as to necessary uniformity, and teaches by that silence.

(3) Especially as the breaches of spirit, or schism, and the breaches of doctrine, or heresy, are sternly condemned.

1 Cor. i. 11. Gal. v. 19.

6. How do unity and manifoldness blend?

In the theological doctrine of the subject: we may speak of the same church of Christ as one and as many. Ethically, we may believe in the essential unity, while we see much diversity; and it is the common duty to avoid all breaches of unity, while the diversities which have sprung from the past must be reduced as much as possible.

7. What is the next note or attribute?

Sanctity, which however has in this world imperfection for its necessary counterpart.

8. Illustrate this more fully.

As to the mystical fellowship of that body which is *the fulness of Him that filleth all in all*, it is regarded prophetically as separated from the world and presented without spot. But, speaking of the Church of Christ on earth, it is (1) actually holy in a relative sense, as a body separated from the world now and to be separated for ever; and (2) it has as a community a real but partial internal holiness. The relative and the real holiness will not be one and perfectly coincide until *the time of harvest*, when the wheat and the tares are severed.

Eph. i. 23. Matt. xiii. 30.

9. How is this seen in the note of visibility?

(1) The church of the New Testament is a visible organisation: very clearly defined, both from the world and within itself. No corporate body has ever surpassed it in this.

(2) It is at the same time invisible or mystical or spiritual. *The Lord knoweth them that are His* in the *great house.* 2 Tim. ii. 19, 20.

(3) But we never find the distinction clearly expressed. These two counterparts of visible and invisible are the simplest of all in the scripture, which however always make the former more prominent than the latter. It is, strictly speaking, rather the kingdom than the church which is invisible.

10. And how in that of catholicity?

As a scriptural note catholicity signifies universality: as differing from the church of Judaism, by embracing all nations; and as distinguished from the individual churches of cities and provinces and lands. Gal. i. 2. Rev. i. 4.

11. How is apostolic a scriptural note?

The pentecostal church *continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and in fellowship*, and, as *the household of God*, it is *built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets.* Acts ii. 42. Eph. ii. 19.

12. What is meant by indefectible and mutable?

(1) The visible church shall abide unto the Lord's coming; *the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.* Matt. xvi. 18.

(2) But individual churches may be dissolved, or corrupt the faith and be removed. Rev. ii. 5.

(3) The two counterparts—the church permanent and the churches transitory—are therefore scriptural; and of great importance, both for the rebuke of bigotry and the relief of doubt.

13. How may the predicates militant and triumphant be asserted of the same one subject?

The church militant is always in conflict with the enemies of her Head, both without and within. As triumphant the same church is in Him victorious; part of it already enjoys the peace of final victory. 2 Cor. ii. 14. Rev. vii. 14—17.

§ 3. Historical.

1. What has been the significance of the notes in ecclesiastical history?

The term was early used to define the church by its

marks of prerogative and distinction. But it gradually came to denote the tests by which the true church was distinguished from the false.

2. How is this illustrated by the four notes in the early creeds?

In the Apostles' the notes are "holy, catholic;" in the Nicene "catholic"; in the Constantinopolitan, "one, catholic, apostolic." Each is an attribute of excellence, and a watchword of discrimination from some heresy of the day.

3. Why do we not limit ourselves to these?

Because the relations of the church are much changed; and the additional characteristics have acquired much importance, especially since the reformation. Around these notes hang almost all ecclesiastical controversies.

4. What controversies are touched by the note of unity?

The question between unity and uniformity; and that between unity and schism.

(1) As to the former, the will of the Spirit has been declared from the beginning: there has never been one outward form of Christianity in the world since the early centuries. It has been found vain to aim at a national uniformity; or even to maintain uniformity in any one place. However desirable that might seem, the One Head of the church has become the Head of manifold and various churches, using them all for the edification of the saints, for the maintenance of the truth, and for the diffusion of the gospel.

(2) As to the latter: schism is in the New Testament a great sin; and therefore it is wrong to break the uniformity of the church. From an apostate church separation is a duty; but, whether this separation be personal or of communities, it must be the last resort, and involves deep responsibility.

5. How does this apply to modern Christendom?

The state of the Christian religion shows that there is no true unity save that which is spiritual. Uniformity is the watchword of the old communions: the Oriental, however, counts Romanism a schism; and Romanism counts all bodies

schisms which do not submit to the chair of St. Peter. National churches are generally based on the principle of exclusiveness, but sooner or later they are constrained to abandon this.

6. How does the note of sanctity involve controversy?

Mainly through the question of discipline: which must have as its main principle the maintenance of the internal purity of the church; but at the same time must remember that the fellowship as such has an external and relative holiness.

7. What are the specific bearings of this on ecclesiastical history?

These must be viewed in connection with the note of visibility and its counterpart.

(1) The visible church is only holy at best by imputation. But this truth has been perverted: by making external union with the community suffice; by relaxation of discipline; and by neglect of fences around holy ordinances.

(2) The invisible church, in Christ, is truly sanctified. But this truth has been perverted: by those who have in all ages made membership dependent on experience and confession of spiritual renewal; and have accordingly drawn the line too sharply between the church and the congregation.

8. How does this bear on societies within the church?

From the beginning these have been a refuge from a church too much like the world, and taking two lines: one, the retreat into religious orders, following the "counsels of perfection"; another, more especially since the reformation dawned, seeking more intimate fellowship and mutual supervision in voluntary associations.

9. What has been the general course of these interior societies?

Some have declined and withered away; some have had a long and healthy existence, as in Germany; and some, finally, have become themselves separate churches. Of this last the Methodist Societies are the most remarkable instance in the history of Christendom.

10. Why the most remarkable?

Because they have to a great extent succeeded in combining all the essentials of a Christian church and of a society within the church: their Class-meeting organisation being the centre of the latter.

11. How has the note of catholicity been applied?

In the early creeds the word catholic was used to signify the one universal body as opposed to fragmentary and isolated heresies and schisms. It then had a good meaning; as the bodies representing errors which the several articles of the creeds condemned were really separations from the true church. But since the falling asunder of Eastern and Western Christendom there has been no catholic visible church strictly one in external representation.

12. What is here the relation of heresy to schism?

The term schism (σχίσμα) means division viewed as to the corporate body, the term heresy (αἵρεσις) makes prominent the private judgment which leads to it. But the history of Christianity shews that the words must be applied with discrimination: they have been more abused than almost any others.

13. What principles of discrimination are necessary?

(1) It should be remembered that schism is not chargeable on the mere fact of separation: the body departed from may so act as to render the separation necessary; and separated bodies, called sects, have had the seal of Divine approval in their subsequent history.

(2) The term heresy is indefinite; Christianity was called a Heresy; and the only use of the word now valid is to note those communions which have departed from the essentials of New-Testament doctrine.

Acts xxiv. 14.

(3) Every church is responsible for its maintenance of the catholic doctrine against heresy, and of the catholic spirit against schism.

14. What have been the bearings of the note of apostolicity?

At first it was the mark of churches founded by apostles

or their authority; then it became the mark of fidelity to apostolic teaching. The latter use it retains.

15. What errors have crept in with regard to this?

Mainly, that which is based on an erroneous view of apostolical succession: the theory, namely, (1) that the authority of the apostles has descended in lineal succession through the bishops; (2) that the primacy of St. Peter has descended through the line of the bishops of Rome; and (3) that the true church can be found only where this descent can be traced, at least in its broad outlines.

16. What is the effect of this?

Unlimited confusion and uncertainty. As applied by Rome, it excludes from Christendom all the Eastern churches before the Reformation, and the entire Protestant world since; as applied by other episcopal communities, it cuts off all non-episcopal communions, and makes their own position very doubtful, even on their own principles.

17. How does the article of "the communion of saints" bear on the whole subject of the notes?

(1) As an article of faith, it asserts that all true Christians believe in their common fellowship with the Holy Trinity in Christ, with the whole community of true believers in the past and present, on earth and in heaven; and in the reality of a mystical oneness in spite of many and wide divisions.

(2) As a confession of that faith it involves the responsibility of using all means to lessen divisions and promote brotherly love: by embracing every opportunity of cooperation for the spread of the Redeemer's kingdom, which is the one end for which the several churches exist.

II.

The Church as the Sphere of Worship.

1. What does this subject embrace?

The worship of the congregation; the public means and ordinances of grace; and the Christian ministry.

2. How are these related in our analysis?

The first includes the whole service of public devotion as going up to God; the second regards the fellowship of Christ's people as receiving blessings from God through appointed channels; and the third the official representatives of the Christian church in both these relations.

I. The Worship of the Congregation.

§ 1. Christian Worship.

1. What are the special characteristics of this worship?

It is the highest form of that public homage which in every age God has received from His people as such.

2. How is Christian worship distinguished as the highest?

(1) As presented to the Triune God in His final revelation of Himself; (2) through the Mediator now fully made known; (3) as no longer ritualistic but in harmony with the perfected spirituality of worship itself; and (4) in accordance with the full manifestation of the nature of the church it is now, as it never was before, congregational.

3. What are the essential and common characteristics of all public worship?

(1) Adoration of God Himself, praise of His perfections and works, thanksgiving for His mercies: as the tributes due to the Supreme from His people.

(2) Confession, prayer, intercession: as demanded by their own sinful character, their needs, and their charity.

(3) The assembling together to offer both.

4. Has this last been universal?

Yes: but with differences in the several dispensations as to the set times and the places and the ceremonial of worship.

5. What is the Christian law as to place?

Whereas in the old economy there was one place of
Deut. xii. 1. sacrifice where the congregation as such might

gather, the ordinance now is *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* Matt. xviii. 20.

6. And as to time?

(1) The sabbath is still hallowed as the day of rest and worship: as the day set apart by God and *made for man.* Mark ii. 27.

(2) But this is now, like the supper and the church itself, appropriated for Christ: *the Lord's day;* observed as such from the first assembly on the day of His resurrection onwards. Rev. i. 10.

(3) In former ages other times and seasons were appointed; but these are now left to the discretion of the people themselves.

7. And as to ceremonial?

Little is said of this in the New Testament; *Let all things be done decently and in order* is the rule. The ritual of the temple found no place; and the frame of worship was rather conformed to that of the synagogue: prayers, liturgical or other; reading of scripture; and exhortation. 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

§ 2. Historical.

1. What were the earliest corruptions of worship?

It gradually became conformed to that ritual sacrificial service which, as such, had been abolished by the gospel; and corrupted the simplicity of devotion by undue use of symbols.

2. Are then ritualism and sacrificial worship combined?

Almost all the ancient rites were directly or indirectly connected with the service of the visible altar: the Christian altar is invisible. *We have an altar:* but Jesus is its only priest. Ritualism is essential to worship; but ritualism may be said to signify that kind of worship which in its ministers and their vestments, its manifold symbols and their teaching, is based on the continual renewal of a sacrifice which was *once offered: one sacrifice for sins for ever.* Heb. xiii. 10. Heb. ix. 28; x. 12.

3. What was the effect of this principle?

The Christian worship became a priestly ministration at an altar; the spiritual priesthood of all believers was lost sight of; private, family, and social devotion were thrown into

disparagement; free prayer was too much lost in the liturgical form; and the preaching of the word was made too subordinate.

4. How did the undue use of symbols appear?

In every part of worship: in the place, in the ministerial garments, in the festivals and feasts, in the canonical hours of devotion, and in numberless ceremonials which corrupted or obscured the simplicity of the sacraments.

5. But have corruptions been all on one side?

No: in every age, but in later times especially, simplicity has been carried too far. Distinction of times has been rejected; and the Christian Lord's day has been classed with the Jewish sabbath, of which St. Paul says that *the substance is of Christ.* The obligation of public assembling has been lightly regarded; the pure element of worship sometimes sacrificed to preaching; and irreverence too often is the opposite extreme of superstitious ceremonialism.

Col. ii. 17.

II. The Means of Grace.

1. What is the widest import of this term?

It signifies, generally, all the ordinances appointed by God through which we receive His covenant blessings: hence the word, prayer, faith, worship are means of grace.

2. Is grace limited to these?

There is a universal grace which comes through the Mediator, the Supreme Medium of grace, to the world through the Spirit. But the term here specially refers to the appointed channels provided in the church: the word, united prayer, and sacraments, severally and unitedly.

3. In what sense is the word one of the means?

(1) The written word is publicly and privately, in all dispensations, the medium of communion with God. (2) But, in the Christian church, that word is made the instrument of conviction, conversion and sanctification: in the institute of

teaching and preaching. (3) No other means of any kind is a channel of grace without the word.

4. In what sense is prayer such a channel?

(1) This also is the universal way of access to God and blessing from Him: without it also no other means are effectual. (2) But in the Christian church united prayer is a special institution with which God connects His covenant blessing.

5. And in what sense the sacraments?

They also are institutions—like preaching and common prayer—with which the grace of the gospel is connected.

6. What is the relation of the word and prayer and sacraments

It may be said that (1) the word teaches and promises the grace; (2) prayer seeks and finds it by faith; and (3) the sacraments confirm and seal it through the Spirit.

III. The Sacraments.

§ 1. Scriptural.

1. What is the relation of sacraments to the Christian covenant?

They were ordained by Christ Himself to be to His people what the emblems of the law were to the Jews, tokens or pledges of His grace.

2. Did they supersede all the ancient ceremonial symbols?

Yes; but especially circumcision, which was the token of admission to the covenant; and the passover, which was the annual commemoration of its privileges: baptism takes the place of the former, and the Lord's supper that of the latter.

3. Then they may be called institutions of Christianity?

The only permanent, unchangeable and universal institutions: their simple rites being established for ever; their outward observance being the badges of Christian profession; and

their inward blessing to faith being the assurance of the grace they signify.

4. What terms signify this assurance?

They are signs by which God declares His grace; and seals by which He pledges it to our faith.

5. Are they then channels of grace?

No ordinance, no rite, no institution of God is without its appropriate grace. Every Divine word and every believing prayer is a channel of grace; and the sacraments also through the word of God and the prayer of faith are means of grace.

6. But are they not by their very nature only remembrancers and pledges?

They are seals of a covenant: and the seal is (1) the Divine signature that God will fulfil His promise according to the terms and conditions of the covenant: (2) the internal assurance impressed on the soul that He does fulfil it.

7. What is the relation of the two sacraments of the covenant of grace in Christ?

The last words, IN CHRIST, answer. They seal the believer's union with Christ and participation in Him of all the privileges of the covenant: one sacrament being that of the first UNION with Him, the other that of abiding COMMUNION with Him.

§ 2. Historical.

1. What has been the current of thought on the subject?

It has taken two lines; one overvaluing the sacraments, and the other undervaluing them, as means of grace.

2. What has been the history of the former error?

(1) From the earliest times there was a tendency to regard the church as the depository of mysteries: baptism being the initiation, the supper the inmost secret, and all the doctrines and ceremonies of religion between. The Greek *μυστήριον* and the Latin sacramentum both at first signified every revealed mystery; but were gradually limited to these.

(2) By degrees this idea of a sacramental Christianity

took the form of a multiplication of sacraments, so as to meet all the requirements of human nature: baptism for the consecration of birth; confirmation, of adult age; the eucharist, of spiritual nourishment; penance, for pardon of actual sin; matrimony for the sanctification of family life; orders, for the consecration of the church and its authority; extreme unction for the departure from time and the final sealing of probation.

3. How did the reformation affect the sacramental idea?

(1) It was gradually brought back to New-Testament principles: gradually, for at the outset a compromise sprang up which allowed penance and orders to be sacramentals though not sacraments. This distinction is still resorted to.

(2) The council of Trent decreed that the seven sacraments were ordained by Christ as the sole channels of grace, though allowing the supremacy of the Eucharist.

(3) The Protestant standards all finally asserted the validity of only two sacraments: declaring that no one of the added five was "ordained by Christ Himself" as having "a visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."

4. Did it abolish the connection of grace with their administration?

(1) It opposed the theory known by the words "opus operatum," which, as laid down by the schoolmen, signified that grace was inherent in the sacraments and always communicated as "a work wrought" through them: first, without necessary cooperation of faith; secondly, the "obex" or impediment of mortal sin not hindering; and, thirdly, the "intention" of the administrator being that of the church.

(2) But the connection of grace with the two sacramental emblems was maintained by all the formularies and doctors of the reformation; though that connection was differently viewed, whether as to the nature or as to the time of the grace.

5. How may the difference be stated?

(1) All the Lutheran standards held that the two sacraments are the two chief channels of grace for the beginning and the

continuance of the new life; their benefit, however, depending on faith.

6. How did the Arminians treat the sacraments?

As having sprung from the Reformed branch, they also regarded them as means of a grace not by any means confined to the time of their use. The Arminian doctrine laid more emphasis than had been laid before on their relation to the covenant, and to the mutual obligation implied in it.

7. How has the second tendency been exhibited?

(1) Some of the mystics rose above all means; and, holding lightly the institution of a visible church, of course disregarded or unduly spiritualised the sacraments.

(2) An extreme form of this in modern times is seen in the Friends, who think that the sacraments were designed to be transitional: rites being inconsistent with a spiritual religion.

(3) But Zwingli earlier taught that they were simply signs, connected with grace only through their operation on the devout mind. And this view is still entertained by many who regard the signs as, so to speak, pictorial representations.

8. What is the bearing of the sacramental terminology on the question?

(1) The four terms, mystery and sacrament, sign and seal, are not expressly applied to these sacred ordinances. But they have been bound up with the teaching of the church of Christ from the beginning. (2) Mystery imports that the "inward and spiritual grace" hidden behind "the outward and visible sign" is to be traced in its effects, not investigated in its nature. Sacrament keeps its original meaning of a binding pledge which unites the two parties in the covenant. (3) The sign and seal must not be sundered: the Divine sign of the grace is a Divine seal also. The words are derived from the teaching of St. Paul concerning the faith of Abraham, who *received the sign* (σημεῖον) *of circumcision*, as *a seal of* (σφραγῖδα), or assurance of his possessing, *the righteousness of the faith which he had while he was in uncircumcision.*

Rom. iv. 11.

IV. Baptism.

§ 1. In the New Testament.

1. What is Christian baptism?

The rite ordained by our Lord to be the sign of admission into the church; and the seal of union with Himself and participation in the blessings of the Christian covenant.

2. What is its history in the New Testament?

We have one central record of institution: preceded by certain preparations in the Gospels, and followed in the later books by many illustrative references to its meaning.

3. Is it then peculiar to the Christian revelation?

By no means. It has an Old-Testament history also. Washing with water was part of the ritual of the law; there are many figurative allusions in the Prophets to its future significance; and it is probable that between Jewish and Christian times proselytes of both sexes were baptised.

4. What was the baptism of John the Baptist?

It was a distinct institution: by which those who received it were pledged to repent and prepare for the coming Christ. It was *John's baptism* and it was *unto repentance.* Acts xix. 3. Matt. iii. 11.

5. Then it was not the first form of Christian baptism?

Strictly it was not: the hour for this rite, like that of the Lord's supper, had not come: (1) because the Lord was instead of all ordinances; and (2) because the Christian church, for which these rites were intended, had not yet been founded.

6. But His disciples baptised by the Lord's permission? John iv. 2.

Only on the principle that Jesus *must increase* by humbling Himself to all the preparatory ministrations for His coming and work. Of His own disciples He said: *Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.* John iii. 30. John xv. 3.

7. What significance is in the words of the institution?

It was a command to baptise *into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost;* and to *disciple all nations* in the Name of Jesus, the only meaning of discipleship.

Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

8. Does the baptism here precede the discipling?

The order is left indefinite. But it is to be inferred:

(1) That, whatever may be said to the contrary, children would from the outset have their part; and they were baptised in order to their future instruction.

(2) That in the case of adults the discipleship must be regarded as preceding baptism, or accompanying it.

(3) That the teaching to *observe all things whatsoever I commanded you* would follow as the end of all.

Matt. xxviii. 20.

9. What light does the subsequent historical observance throw on it?

We see that the Lord's ordinance was always honoured, even when the blessings it sealed had been already given; that households were baptised; and that it was the universally known token of Christian profession.

10. Does the baptism of households necessarily imply the baptism of children?

That is the natural inference, and it is supported by the following important considerations:

(1) Christianity extended the covenant from one holy people to all nations.

(2) Circumcision and the passover both marked emphatically the family character of the old covenant.

(3) On the great day of transition we hear that the promise was *to you and to your children.*

Acts ii. 39.

(4) The children of Christian parents, as such, are said to be *holy;* that is, as specially consecrated to the Trinity, and therefore to be trained in the discipline of the Lord. The rite was necessarily the seal of this; and we never read that they were trained for subsequent baptism.

1 Cor. vii. 14.

11. How does St. Paul deal with the subject?

He was himself baptised, notwithstanding his vision of Jesus; and notwithstanding his special call as an apostle he sometimes administered the rite; and though *sent not to baptise*, he was sent to teach more fully than any other the meaning of baptism. 1 Cor. i. 17.

12. How may we show that teaching?

Under two heads: first, in the case of believers as parties to the covenant, baptism is referred to as the remembrancer of obligations; secondly, as to the God of the covenant, baptism is always strictly associated with its blessings as conveyed with it.

13. Give instances of the former.

Answering the question, *Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?* the apostle asks again, *Are ye ignorant that all we who were baptised into Christ Jesus were baptised into His death?* The same kind of appeal he makes to the Galatians, and it is silently heard everywhere. Rom. vi. 1, 3. Gal. iii. 27.

14. And of the latter.

It is regarded (1) as having been the seal of union with Christ generally, in His death and life: *Having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him.* Col. ii. 12.

(2) As the seal of the several blessings of the Christian estate. Of pardon: *Be baptised, and wash away thy sins*, answering to St Peter's words, *Unto the remission of your sins.* Of the new life: *Ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptised into Christ did put on Christ.* Of sanctification: *That He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the laver of water with the word.* Baptism is connected with all alike. Acts xxii. 16; ii. 38. Gal. iii. 26, 27. Eph. v. 26.

15. Is it then regarded as the channel of their bestowment?

No, but as the outward and visible pledge that they have been, are now, or will be bestowed. There is but one Channel of grace to man; one Agent, the Spirit of grace; and, in all the passages which introduce baptism, faith and the word are avowedly or by implication included.

16. Does not St. Peter speak expressly of the salvation of baptism?

He certainly says that baptism is an *antitype*, or *like figure*, to the water of the flood through which the few were saved. But they were saved in the ark; and the apostle adds his limitation: *Even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the inquiry of a good conscience toward God.*

1 Peter iii. 20, 21.

17. But has not our Lord given His own conclusive testimony?

Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. This undoubtedly unites the seal and the grace; but does not define the bond of their union. By adding, *So is everyone that is born of the Spirit*, the Saviour shows that the bond is not essential and absolute.

John iii. 5. John iii. 8.

18. Does He elsewhere allude to this connection?

At the end of His ministry: *He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but He that disbelieveth shall be condemned.*

Mark xvi. 16.

19. What do we learn from this?

(1) We mark the same absence of baptism in the second clause: the condemnation is not absolutely connected with the lack of baptism.

(2) We see that, as the new birth is spoken of in the beginning, so salvation generally is united with baptism at the close, of our Lord's teaching on the subject.

2. Historical.

1. What traces of patristic error appear in early times?

(1) Pardon and the new life were too closely connected with the rite: which led to its frequent postponement, lest such great privileges should be irreparably lost.

(2) The rite itself kept pace in its abundant ceremonials with many superstitious additions to the doctrine.

2. What was its connection with the catechumenate?

An order of catechists was set apart to instruct candidates

for baptism, or catechumens: these passing through successive and strict stages into the privilege of full membership.

3. How did this comport with infant baptism?

For a long time a large number of the baptised were adults; and the catechumenate was specially for them. But we have the testimony of antiquity that infants were baptised from the beginning as "apostolical usage."

4. Can we trace confirmation as linked with it?

Very early the simplicity of our Lord's institution was corrupted by the anointing and imposition of hands to signify the gift of the Spirit as supplementing the removal of guilt. But this was not separated from baptism by the Orientals, nor by the Westerns until the second sacrament was established.

5. Did antiquity agree as to the manner of baptising?

Immersion was the prevalent early practice, and is still so in the East: a triple immersion. But pouring or sprinkling gradually superseded it in the West.

6. What are the several differences as to the virtue of this sacrament?

(1) The mediæval church, and the council of Trent, determined that in baptism the sin of the nature is taken away: concupiscence, however, or the fuel of sin remaining; and to be conquered by the Holy Spirit given in the second sacrament of confirmation.

(2) The formularies of the reformation rejected this doctrine of a necessary supplement of confirmation; and they denied that the concupiscence remaining after baptism is without sin. But they differed on other important points.

7. What were their leading differences?

The Lutherans held that baptism is the sole appointed channel of regenerating grace. The Calvinistic Reformed held that, in the case of the elect, it conveys as well as pledges that grace; but conveys it only as an external attestation of the secret work of the Spirit, at the time or afterwards wrought according to the conditions of the covenant, and to its true heirs.

8. What is the Anglican doctrine of baptism?

In Art. xxvii. it is declared to be "a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the church; the promises of the forgiveness of sins, and of our adoption to be the sons of God are verily signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and prayer increased, by virtue of prayer unto God."

9. Who were the Anabaptists?

The Anabaptists (*ἀνά*, repetition) were a fanatical sect which sprang up at the Reformation; holding, among many revolutionary tenets, the invalidity of infant baptism. They must be distinguished from the Baptists, who in the seventeenth century arose in England and have spread extensively in America.

10. What is the general position of the Baptists?

(1) Their view of the Christian church is that it consists of those who give credible evidence of personal faith; (2) they admit as candidates for baptism only professed believers; (3) therefore rejecting the baptism of infants; (4) and they regard immersion in water as the scriptural rite.

11. By what arguments are these principles met?

(1) The Christian church is a continuation of the one church which included children from the beginning. Our Lord precluded all misunderstanding by declaring *Of such is the kingdom of heaven*; and the apostles accordingly never ordain it, but take it for granted: all nations including all families. Hence they address children, and speak of them, as members of the church.

Matt. xix. 14. Eph. vi.

(2) Baptism is the final seal of the Abrahamic covenant in particular: of which circumcision was the first seal. Baptism is *the circumcision of Christ.* The baptised are *heirs according to promise*: the promise which is *unto you and to your children.*

Col. ii. 10, 11. Gal. iii. 29. Acts ii. 39.

(3) As to the mode of baptism, nothing can be proved against the validity of immersion: the original word admits this meaning, and it aptly expresses the symbolical idea of

baptism UNTO CHRIST, *buried with him in baptism.* But it is highly probable that the original practice was pouring or sprinkling: from the analogy of the phrases used to signify the application of the blood of sprinkling and the effusion of the Holy Spirit; and from the fact that multitudes were baptised. Col. ii. 12.

12. Does the baptism of children imply that the grace sealed in the sacrament is given to them?

Certainly, whatever blessing belongs to their acceptance by Christ as His own, to their being acknowledged as included in the covenant, to their being received into the Christian church, and admitted to the adoption of children, is sealed and given to them in the Holy Ghost.

13. Is this their baptismal regeneration?

It is their baptismal adoption: regeneration is the change wrought in the nature when the Son of God becomes the power of a new life; and of that, as of internal righteousness and internal purity, unconscious infants are incapable.

14. Is such a distinction tenable?

Let the following considerations be weighed. (1) The blessing of our Christian estate—the new life with its righteousness and sanctification—all have their external and internal signification or aspect: in the case of infants we can think only of the external. (2) Hence in their baptism they are released from the condemnation resting on the race, they are adopted into the Divine family, and they are outwardly sanctified or consecrated.

15. May not that be said of all infants, baptised or unbaptised?

(1) To assert this is to make void the Christian covenant: to the conditions of which God binds us, though He does not bind Himself. (2) Moreover, there is a difference between the general grace that is connate with redeemed children and the special promise of that covenant.

16. But can unconscious children partake of grace in any way?

As certainly as they partake of that sin which needs

grace. The Spirit of *the chastening and admonition of the Lord* is pledged to them: that Spirit of prevenient grace which, neither in adults nor in infants, is full regeneration.

Eph. vi. 4.

V. The Lord's Supper.

§ 1. Scriptural.

1. What means this sacrament?

It is an institution ordained for perpetual observance to commemorate the Saviour and especially His death; to be the seal of the individual and constant union of His people with Him by faith; and a bond of their communion with each other in their common Lord and Head.

2. How do the names it bears indicate this?

(1) It is the EUCHARIST, as a thankful commemoration: from the Lord's act of giving thanks. It may be observed that of the two words εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε the latter gave the first name in the Acts, the former we adopt.

1 Cor. xi. 24. Acts ii. 42.

(2) It is the Communion: the κοινωνία, *participation in the blood* and in *the body of Christ.*

1 Cor. x. 16.

(3) It is THE LORD'S SUPPER: that is, a common feast; *When therefore ye assemble yourselves together.* There were gatherings without it; but this was the most sacred fellowship in the gathering; hence the Greeks called it the συνάξις.

1 Cor. xi. 20.

3. How was the institution related to the passover?

Our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ. He ordained His commemorative feast at the close of the last typical feast; retained its *cup of blessing;* but included more in His eucharist than the ancient rite represented.

1 Cor. v. 7. 1 Cor. x. 16.

4. What light does its history in the New Testament shed?

We have only a few references; fewer than to the other sacrament; but enough.

(1) In the Acts the sacred use of the ordinance is referred

to as very common, being apparently celebrated on the Lord's Day; and, with allusion to one marked symbolical act, as *the breaking of bread.* Acts ii. 42.

(2) In the first epistle to the Corinthians, the sacred use is referred to, but chiefly the abuse. There we learn that it was connected with a previous common feast, the Agapæ; that a prayer of invocation, rather than consecration, was offered; that the partaking was the seal of fellowship in the sacrifice of Christ; that the apostle makes an emphatic distinction between the ALTAR of the Jews and the TABLE of the Lord; and that individual self-examination was necessary, in order that those who DISCERNED themselves might DISCERN the LORD's body, and not be judged. 1 Cor. x. 11. 1 Cor. x. 18, 21. 1 Cor. xi. 29, 31.

5. What is St. John's relation to this sacrament?

He does not record the institution of this or the other sacrament. But, as in the third chapter of his Gospel he gives our Lord's high testimony to the true meaning of baptism, so in the sixth chapter he gives His testimony to the true meaning of the supper.

§ 2. Historical.

1. What were the first traces of development?

In the age succeeding the apostles both the doctrine and the usages of this sacrament were uncorrupted. But afterwards signs appeared of a tendency to make it the central mystery of Christian worship, and the germs of those coming errors which have transubstantiated the whole design of our Lord in its institution.

2. How did they commence to take form?

(1) In respect to the eucharistical sacrifice, the memorial character was gradually changed into a renewal of the one oblation on the cross.

(2) And then of necessity the emblems were gradually changed into the very substance of the offering itself.

3. Did this perversion proceed unchecked?

In the ninth century there was a great controversy. Paschasius Radbertus boldly avowed a conversion of the ele-

ments: whence this error is sometimes called Paschasianism. In the eleventh century Berengarius was a protestant on this subject. But in the thirteenth century, at the Lateran Council of 1215, transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass took their final form.

4. What followed from this?

The adoration of the host (hostia, sacrifice), with the various ceremonies which made the table of the Lord an altar, and His simple memorial feast a most elaborate ceremonial. Masses were offered for the departed: even as the other sacrament was very early perverted by those who baptised for the dead.

5. Did the Greek church keep pace?

In essentials it did; but it did not withhold the cup from the laity, and administered the eucharist to children.

6. How is the secret mystery of transubstantiation defined?

On the one hand, it is declared to be an unsearchable mystery, as much so as the incarnation: the whole Christ comes into being anew that he may be again offered. On the other hand, this explanation is offered to reason: that the substance of bread and wine are gone, but the accidents remain.

7. What was the Lutheran protest?

It rejected the repetition of the one sacrifice, as also the transubstantiation of the elements. But it insisted on a real presence of the glorified humanity of Christ IN and WITH and UNDER the emblems: literally and not spiritually partaken, for good or evil. This has been termed consubstantiation: the real Christ WITH the substance of bread.

8. How did Calvin and the Reformed treat it?

Calvin's teaching, keeping far from the Lutheran actual participation in the glorified body as present WITH the elements, yet regarded the feast as the most special union of the soul with the whole Christ in heaven by faith. And Zuingli earnestly maintained a special sacramental blessing in the spiritual eating.

9. What is the teaching of the Real Presence which some make their watchword?

It is the dogma which has come about between Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation: making the effect of priestly consecration to be the conjunction of the Lord with the elements in a REAL manner (PRÆSENTIA REALIS); not that He is spiritually present, and only to faith.

10. If this is abandoned what is there in the Lord's supper more than any other act of united worship?

There is a real presence by the Spirit, who specially reveals Christ as the Bread of Life to the faith of the recipient, at once assuring him of his communion with the life of his Head and strengthening that life.

VI. The Christian Ministry.

§ 1. The Ministry.

1. What change did our Lord introduce?

He abolished a sacrificing priesthood, being Himself the one sacrifice and the one priest; and the effects of that change were very great throughout the whole institution.

2. What were its effects?

The character of the institution was totally changed. One tribe had been set apart for the functions of the priesthood; it was no longer needed. The office bearers in the new community were to have mainly spiritual functions; and to be called by the Spirit individually.

3. How does the term ministry indicate this?

Not precisely in itself. But the Lord used it to express His service to mankind; and throughout the New Testament it is the most comprehensive word, including all offices to which the Spirit called men and women in the Christian community. Matt. xx. 28.

4. How may we trace the history of the ministry in the New Testament?

As in everything else the events opened the will of God.

Our Lord sent out the seventy, whose ministry terminated on Himself. He chose the Apostles and invested them with plenary authority. They were doubtless instructed by Himself during the forty days; and afterwards the Spirit directed them: first, to organise the diaconate, then to ordain elders, then to gather these elders in what was the germ of future synods. St. Paul left three pastoral epistles in which the Christian ministry takes its final form.

Acts xv. 2.
Acts xx. 17.

§ 2. The Extraordinary or Transitional Ministry.

1. What ground is there for this distinction?

We have clear testimony that during the period of the first establishment of Christianity the Lord by His Spirit gave special endowments to special persons for ministries which were not transmitted by them nor continued in the Church.

2. Is there any evidence that these were transitory?

Only the evidence of fact. Comparing the two passages in which St. Paul treats this subject we find that God SET, and Christ GAVE, and the Spirit DIVIDED to, each, the several offices, from that of the apostles downwards; but in fact some of them were not bestowed everywhere, and in due time ceased.

1 Cor. xii. 28.
Eph. iv. 11, 12.

3. Which of the gifts to the whole church ceased?

Those of the apostles and prophets: these two are peculiarly connected, being the only ones common to those passages. Three times they are united in the epistle to the Ephesians: they are together the foundation, together receive the revelation of the gospel, and together are given to the church. A comparison of these passages will show that these offices were not meant for permanence.

Eph. ii. 20.
Eph. iii. 5.
Eph. iv. 11.

4. What were the apostles?

The twelve men whom the Lord chose and sent with special authority and endowment to lay the foundations of churches and finish the testimony of inspiration to His own person and work.

5. How was their office discharged, and what was its history?

The twelve were sent chiefly to the twelve tribes: the

number being preserved by the choice of Matthias instead of Judas. Three of these were chief, and of these three one: the labours of these only are recorded. Saul, afterwards Paul, was chosen by the Lord Himself after the ascension, especially for the Gentile world. They exercised supreme authority, as the direct representatives of their Master; left no successors; and provided for the permanence of the regular ministry before they departed.

Acts i. 26. Gal. i. 9. Gal i. 8. Acts xiv. 23. 2 Tim. ii. 2.

6. Did they discharge all their duties alone?

They reserved their apostolic authority and responsibility; but delegated some of their functions. More than one wrote holy scripture under their sanction; Barnabas was even termed an apostle; Timothy and Titus were sent under the name of evangelists to carry on the work of the apostle Paul.

Acts xiv. 14. 2 Tim. iv. 5.

7. Were not evangelists given to the congregation?

They were; but St. Paul does not place them among the officers who were SET. Their function was irregular; exercised by men who, though not set apart to the ministry, preached the word. The name was later given to the four writers of the gospels, and is now in common use for such as are set apart to mission preaching: that is, preaching without pastoral function, whether ordained or unordained.

1 Cor. xii. 28. Acts viii. 5.

8. What view may be taken of the transitional ministry?

It was adapted to the time of foundation: miracles from God, and extraordinary authority among men, were needful at the outset; afterwards the gospel was to pervade the world as leaven. At great crises men are still raised up extraordinarily: in their spirit, but not with their name.

§ 3. The Permanent Ministry.

1. How was the regular ministry ordered?

By the ordination of elders to preside over the spiritual affairs of the churches, and the appointment of deacons to preside over their temporal affairs.

2. What was common to these two offices?

The qualification for both was a sound faith and an in-

corrupt life; they formed distinct orders with distinct functions; and are alike referred to as representing the church.

1 Tim. iii. 1-9.

3. What was the difference between them?

(1) The deacons' office was not clearly defined; it was held by both sexes.

Rom. xvi. 1. 1 Tim. v. 9.

(2) The elders were set apart by imposition of hands; their functions are very fully described; and the responsibility of the control of the society seems to have rested only with them.

4. What was the office of the elders?

The pastoral oversight of the congregation generally; particularly, presiding over the offices of worship, preaching and teaching the word, and administering the discipline of the community. Of all this they had the responsibility.

5. Did they constitute one undivided order?

They were one order: presbyters and bishops are in the New Testament names, used interchangeably, of the same office. Similarly, the teachers and rulers were not distinguished from each other; the apostle describes the qualifications of the offices in such a way as to prove this.

Phil. i. 1. 1 Tim. iii.

6. How were they set apart?

By *laying on of the hands of the presbytery;* and of the apostles' hands, while they yet lived.

1 Tim. iv. 14. Acts xiv. 23. Tit. i. 5.

7. What limitations were set to their power?

(1) Their responsibility is said to be directly to the Lord Himself: never to any other tribunal.

Heb. xiii. 17.

(2) But they used the HELPS raised up by the Spirit: in teaching, preaching, counsel and government.

1 Cor. xii. 28.

(3) And their power was restrained by their fellowship, more or less intimate, with other churches.

8. Have we any evidence as to this last point?

It pervades the apostolical history. The apostles and elders decide common questions in Jerusalem. St. Paul summons the elders or bishops to Miletus

Acts xv. 2. Acts xx. 17.

And there is constant reference to the customs of the churches. All these give hints of what was afterwards a union of churches. 1 Cor. xi. 16.

9. Are there any indications of the gradual rise of a higher order than that of presbyters?

In every body of elders one would have the first place. He seems to be called in the book of symbols *the angel of the church.* Timothy and Titus evidently had an authority like that of the apostles. But the rise of an order with functions and prerogatives such as were very early appropriated to the bishops has no trace in the New Testament. Rev. ii. 1.

§ 4. Historical.

1. What is the range of historical development here?

The various theories of the Christian ministry are the key to the entire history of Christendom, in its strength and in its weakness, in its purity and in its corruption. They lie also at the foundation of all the different forms of church government

2. How did that development proceed at first?

(1) The ministry were very early regarded as the Lord's lot (the clerus), like the levitical priesthood, and distinguished from the people (laymen, λαικοί), in an Ordo sacerdotalis or ecclesiasticus.

(2) During the ante-Nicene age the episcopate became universal: the bishop being the representation of unity. There were country-bishops (CHOREPISCOPI) around the towns; with metropolitan bishops of the leading cities; and all local synods represented the unity of the episcopate, which represented the unity of the church: an uninterrupted succession of bishops from the apostles' times being the note of catholicity.

(3) This led in the fifth and sixth centuries to the general acknowledgment that the bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, was the final umpire, bond of union, and source of authority to the Christian commonwealth.

3. Was this ever accepted by the universal Church?

Never for an hour. The Eastern Christians retained their

independence under their patriarchs; and to this day they hold Romanism to be the first form of Dissent.

4. How are we to understand the term hierarchy?

In two senses: (1) Within the ministry itself there were major and minor orders: the former including deacons, priests or presbyters, and bishops; and the bishops having their gradation up to the metropolitans and the see of Rome. (2) As connected with the State, the officials of the Church have had, and still have more or less of worldly status and dignity.

5. Was monasticism related to the ministry?

Not necessarily. The monastic orders were confraternities under special vows: at first chiefly laymen; afterwards composed of clergy and laity; the clergy being the regulars, or under the rule of their orders, as distinguished from the seculars who ministered in the general church.

6. How was ministerial power defined and symbolized?

As the power of the keys (POTESTAS CLAVIUM), a term of general use taken from our Lord's words to St. Peter.

Matt. xvi. 18.

7. How was this understood?

By some in early times as referring to ecclesiastical privileges, granted or denied; by others as signifying the authority of priestly absolution. Finally, however, these were united in the doctrine which underlies the two invented sacraments of penance and orders.

8. What changes did the reformation effect?

The papal or pontifical authority was rejected; the episcopal order, as such, was abolished, though retained in Anglicanism; the idea of the universal priesthood of the church was made prominent, the ministry being based at once on the appointment of the Spirit and the delegation of its authority by the church; and, finally, the power of the keys was restricted to the discipline of the church and the declaration of the terms of forgiveness.

9. What was Calvin's special innovation?

The eldership or presbyterate was established in its rela-

tion as presiding over the churches, in all courts up to the highest: hence the system of Presbyterianism. But Calvin introduced the distinction between teaching elders and ruling elders; founding this demarcation on one passage mainly: *Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially those who labour in the word and in teaching.* The word *especially* does not warrant any such distinction. 1 Tim. v. 17.

10. How was this an innovation?

From the beginning the ordained elders, who are said to *have the rule*, had been set apart entirely from worldly cares: the modern lay-elders are ordained but not set apart. Heb. xiii. 17.

11. How has the institution of the ministry been modified?

By most of the protestant communities the two orders of presbyters and deacons have been preserved, but with much latitude in the terminology. The Anglican retained the separate order and authority of bishops; and made the diaconate more directly pastoral. The Lutherans adopted the ancient term superintendents for certain pastors who had the charge of districts; though in Scandinavia they use the term bishops.

12. What tendencies to abolish the ministry are to be noted?

The Society of Friends applied the same principle to this which they had applied to the church and the sacraments: they hold the ordinances of the New Testament to have been intended for transitory use; limiting the ministry to an individual secret call of the Spirit.

13. What developments have been seen in modern times?

Two opposite extremes have appeared of late. (1) The Brethren, so called, renounce the communion of the present visible church in any of its forms, and deny the Divine authority of an ordained ministry; (2) the Catholic Apostolic Church is based on the presumption that God has in these last days restored the orders of the transitional ministry: apostles, prophets, angels, and even speakers with tongues.

14. What principles should we maintain?

(1) That the government of the church by elders or

presbyters is clearly an ordinance of God; (2) that the laity, by their representatives, originally called deacons, are to be joined with the elders in everything pertaining to the church's tables; (3) that the gifts of the Spirit, no longer miraculous, are given to both classes alike for the general good.

III.

The Church as an Organisation for the World.

1. What topics arise under this head?

Many of great importance: such as the responsibility of the church as the depository and defender of the truth; its missionary vocation; the methods of its spread; the relations of all its communities to each other; and their common relation to the kingdom for which they all prepare.

2. How is the church the depository of the truth?

As the Jews *were entrusted with the oracles of God*, so was *the Faith once for all delivered unto the saints*. Here the Faith is objective, and signifies the Christian revelation; the saints, also, is an expression that denotes, not the sanctified as such, but the body of professed believers.

Rom. iii. 2.
Jude 3.

3. And how is that deposit to be kept?

Wherever the church of Christ is found, it has the completed scriptures as its best possession: to be its standard of faith and its directory of duty and its charter of privileges. To guard the very text of these scriptures is an important function of the Christian community.

4. Is the defence of the faith limited to this?

It is the duty of every church, as it is of every individual Christian, to defend the truth against unbelievers: by its literature and pulpit to give a reason of the Christian hope. Against heresies and all heresy it must protest by its creeds and confessions of faith.

1 Pet. iii. 15.

5. How does the history of the church illustrate this function?

The early symbols were for ages a bond of union; and such they still are, especially the Apostles' and the Nicene, the two really catholic creeds. The later confessions are mainly protests or defences against the corruptions of the ancient churches; and are rather to be held as regulative standards.

6. But do not the differences in these show that the church of Christ has not answered its end?

By no means: there is a body of truth common to them all; and the differences only prove that it is not the Lord's will that His church should be perfected on earth: in other words, the end for which the church is raised up is not the establishment of a perfect dogmatic system of truth.

7. Does the missionary vocation express the end of the church?

It expresses that end so far as the external world is concerned. Visible churches are organisations for the spread of the gospel and the preparation for the final kingdom.

8. Has the history of the church witnessed fidelity to this?

The missionary activity of the Acts of the Apostles continued during the early ages in its purity; after the union of the state with the church the propagation of the gospel went on, but too much under worldly influences, for ages. The sixteenth century was not careful enough to include this great duty of Christendom among its reforms; but the present century has witnessed an extensive revival of missionary zeal.

9. Then, as the world is to be converted, what are the ecclesiastical theories of the process?

They are various: in fact, every doctrine of the church has its distinct doctrine of missions. The papal system has never swerved from the fixed aim to bring all nations under the chair of St. Peter. Some hold to the national or territorial theory: that national branches of Christendom doing their duty at home and abroad will make Christianity in due time universal. The more general idea in this age is that many

denominations sending out independent missions will gradually win the world to the obedience of faith.

10. **What is the result of the whole?**

We must be on our guard against opposite errors.

(1) The church as an institution must not be overvalued: it is not an institution that has any marks of perfection or permanence; it is only the earthly house out of which the spiritual house is rising; and it is utterly vain to seek an outward ecclesiastical constitution, great or small, which perfectly answers the ideal presented in the New Testament.

(2) On the other hand, the visible church is the instrument used by its Head for the accomplishment of His purposes. The humblest and most obscure denomination which is based upon the fundamental doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and the evangelical system of truth which rests upon the Three Divine Persons, is taken up into the government of the church for the salvation of the world.

(3) The Spirit of Christ is the Lord and Giver of life, organic and ecclesiastical; and we cannot look abroad upon Christendom without being constrained to admit that He calls into existence and vivifies and uses communities which, having one common standard of appeal, differ in many subordinate matters.

(4) In every consideration of this subject, whether as it regards our own position or as teachers of others, we must always remember that the one and only true church is that which is possessed by the Spirit of the Head and one with Him.

BOOK VII.

The Last Things.

I. DEATH AND THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

II. THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST: RESURRECTION AND JUDGMENT.

III. THE CONSUMMATION.

BOOK VII.

The Last Things.

Preliminary.

1. Have we here an altogether new field before us?

Not altogether new; since many of the doctrinal and ethical teachings of Christianity have already carried us on to the other world. But there are some aspects of the future that have not yet been considered, and which are generally embraced under eschatology, or the last things.

2. How are these subjects viewed in the New Testament?

As things expressly revealed; of supreme importance; and constantly affecting the present life.

3. But can they be said to be expressly revealed?

There is no clearer revelation in scripture than that which unfolds the future: every Christian doctrine without exception has its fixed issues in the other world. The leading truths of eschatology are perfectly plain.

4. Whence then the obscurity which all men feel?

First, from the nature of the subjects themselves, which though certainly revealed are such as surpass the limits of human understanding. Secondly, the times and seasons are obscure for ethical reasons: their uncertainty is one main element in their moral effect, but at the same time wraps them in a certain undogmatic indefiniteness.

5. What is the perspective opened out in the New Testament?

It varies in different parts: sometimes the return of Christ seems to embrace all; sometimes the resurrection and the judgment; sometimes the future estate of happiness.

6. Guided by the tenour of New-Testament revelation what analysis may be made?

First, there is the intermediate state of departed souls; then the second coming of Christ, for resurrection and judgment; and then the end of the redeeming economy.

7. With what sentiment should we approach this?

Entirely limiting ourselves to the revelation of scripture. Where that is plain, with fearless confidence; where it fails us, with profound caution and submission to be ignorant.

Chapter I.

The Intermediate State.

1. How is this term related to the subject?

It expresses that idea of an interval between the imperfection of the present life and the perfection of the final state of believers which is taught in the New Testament.

2. In what other ways is this estate of men referred to?

It is spoken of generally as death, as the state of the dead, and as the intermediate state of the dead. These three in their relation open the whole subject.

3. But does not the holy text warn us against making this a special department of dogmatics?

Certainly it tells us that *It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgment;* but the interval between death and judgment is largely dilated on, and has important ethical bearings in the Christian scriptures.

Heb. ix. 27.

4. Is there much revelation to guide us?

Perhaps there is no region of theology on which there is poured a clearer light: whether we regard its relation to the past or its relation to the future.

5. But have not many great errors been founded on this page of revelation?

For that very reason, as also for its great practical importance, we should carefully study the text of scripture.

§ 1. Death.

1. How do we here view death?

As the introduction to another world, and therefore as an event in the history of fallen and redeemed man: the separation of the soul from the body.

2. From what death is this distinguished?

(1) From annihilation, which death never means in the Bible; (2) from spiritual death, which is separation of the soul from God, and is independent of natural death: *He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son, hath not life*, that is, is spiritually dead. And of course (3) from eternal death, which is only the spiritual death without hope. 1 John v. 12.

3. What is the relation of this physical death to sin and redemption?

It was the first outward and visible manifestation of the effect of sin; and it will be the last effect of sin from which we shall be saved: *the last enemy that shall be destroyed.* Meanwhile our Saviour *hath abolished death, and brought life and incorruption* (ἀφθαρσίαν) *to light through the gospel.* Rom. v. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 26. 2 Tim. i. 10.

4. How can the abolition of death and its universality be reconciled?

(1) The word here used (like some others of the same class) signifies to annul or negative: so the body of sin, sin itself, the works of the devil, are said to be destroyed or abolished or done away. Rom. vi. 6. Heb. ix. 26. 1 John iii. 8.

(2) Death in every sense is really negatived as a sentence of condemnation; and life is offered to all.

(3) And life and incorruption will hereafter cause it to be forgotten as a penalty.

(4) Meanwhile, it is continued and taken up into the discipline of mankind: as a race and as individuals.

5. How is the Christian doctrine of death connected with immortality?

There are two terms, *incorruption* and *immortality*, which are both used with reference to the resurrection of the body. The immortality of the spirit has nothing to do with the doctrine of death. Corruption and mortality are two aspects of the same change of existence, which implies that the existence continues.

1 Cor. xv. 53, 54.

6. Is then the soul, apart from the body, naturally immortal?

Man was created in the image of God, *Who only hath immortality.*

1 Tim. vi. 16.

7. Did not our Saviour bring back to man a forfeited existence?

That is not the doctrine of scripture. He Himself *tasted death for every man;* and endured the death from which He saved us: physical death as separation of soul and body; spiritual death as the sense of separation of the soul from God; but not the forfeiture of being in any sense.

Heb. ii. 9.

8. How does the Christian revelation distinguish the death of believers from that of others?

(1) By terms peculiar: it is *rest*, and *sleep in Jesus*, and *departure* or *decease.*

1 Thess. i. 7. 1 Thess. iv. 14.

(2) By making it the end and consummation of a voluntary sacrifice of self in union with the Lord; by which God is glorified, and the final victory gained, and death really abolished: *Whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die.* Hence the day of Christ rather than death is always prominent.

2 Tim. iv. 6. 2 Tim. ii. 11. John xxi. 19. 1 Cor. xv. 55. John xi. 26.

§ 2. The Kingdom of the Dead.

1. Does the New Testament assign locality and state to the departed?

In two ways it does so: (1) by separating the dead from the living; (2) by assigning a place corresponding to the character of each class.

2. Is there any resemblance between the Old Testament and the New in this?

As in every other department of revelation, we find the old doctrine not taken away but transfigured and glorified. Continuance after death is taught throughout the ancient scriptures; but our Saviour *has brought life and incorruption to light through the gospel:* He has shed light upon what was obscure; light sufficient for our present probation. 2 Tim. i. 10

3. What was the Old-Testament view of the other state?

Throughout we find an underworld, SHEOL, in which disembodied spirits congregate, below the grave in which their bodies lie. But until He who is our Life appeared, it pleased God to limit religious probation very much to the present world.

4. What were the characteristics of that estate?

It is regarded as the receptacle of all the dead: with faint traces of distinction between good and evil, and without the bright anticipation introduced by the gospel. Job xxx. 23. Ps. xxviii. 3. Eccles. xi. 9

5. How is the state of the departed referred to in the Gospels?

In a continuation of the Old-Testament style: so it is in the parable of Lazarus. But the later Jewish doctrine of a division in hades between the gehenna of fire and the paradise of happiness is alluded to and sanctioned. Luke xvi. 23. Matt. xxiii. 15. Mark ix. 43. Luke xxiii. 43.

6. What change did our Lord's resurrection introduce?

From that time the phraseology changes. The terms hades and gehenna and paradise are seldom used; though the Apocalypse attests their reality. Rev. i. 18. Rev. xx. 14.

7. How does this bear upon our modern Christian vocabulary?

The New Testament does not speak of heaven as entered or hell as receiving the wicked until the day of judgment. It does not, apart from the Apocalypse, vividly define the two regions in hades. Hence there is some room for amendment in our customary phraseology; at least in the interpretation it carries to our minds.

§ 3. Its Intermediate Character.

1. What errors are indicated by this phrase?

That of regarding death as introducing to a consummate estate; that of making it merely a waiting place for an entirely unknown decision.

2. What scriptural objection is there to death being regarded in either of these lights?

(1) As to the former: the entire revelation of judgment, with the glorious promises and the awful doom that are dated from that day, lose their reality if we suppose that death is an immediate introduction to the final heaven. As saved, we are

Rom. viii. 23. *waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.*

(2) As to the latter: the entire revelation of the great release and victory in dying—*O death, where is thy sting?*—

1 Cor. xv. 55. 2 Cor. v. 8. and our being *with the Lord*, forbid the thought that the redeemed are uncertain as to their future.

3. What kind of activity or progress is indicated as possible or probable?

As we reject the sleep of the soul, we must believe that its thoughts, feelings and volitions will go on in the course determined in life: that is, be subject to development. And it may be that what was an almost unconscious preparation for the gospel may be quickened into its conscious activity. But here revelation keeps silence.

4. How can this be distinguished from probation?

Probation as it concerns man is bound up with the present life, its trials, its opportunities, and its duties: it is that of man in his integrity as body and soul, redeemed by Christ. At the judgment men are made manifest, *that each*

2 Cor. v. 10. *one may receive the things done in the body.*

5. What bearing has our Lord's descent to hades on this subject generally?

It is a clear testimony that the Redeemer of mankind has

Rom. xiv. 9. taken possession of the estate of the dead. He is *the*

Lord of both the dead and the living. He went and preached unto the spirits in prison; but what His proclamation was we know not, and this text carries no doctrine. This however we know, that the province of the dead is in the charge of the just and merciful Friend of mankind. 1 Pet. iii. 19.

6 Does the Apocalypse throw light on the intermediate state?

Very much: for, though it is a book of visions and symbols, there is throughout a ground of reality. It teaches that the departed are in a state of full activity, serving their Lord *day and night in His temple*, even as their *fellow servants also, and their brethren* below, waiting in patience and hope, and crying, *How long?* They have *washed their robes;* but the Lord is *their Shepherd* still. The state of the departed ungodly is not referred to; but the general judgment is the end to which all vistas of prophecy lead. Rev. vii. 15. Rev. vi. 11, 10. Rev. vii. 14, 17. Rev. xx. 11, 13.

§ 4. Historical.

1. What has been the general current of human thought on this subject?

The mythologies of almost all nations show traces of a belief that the soul passes after death into a state of activity without the body: either into a series of transmigrations, as in the East; or to an immediate judgment, as in the West.

2. What speculations belong particularly to Christian times?

They have ranged over three distinct lines: regarding the intermediate state as one of unconsciousness; or as the sphere of purgatorial discipline; or as a continuation of the earlier neglected probation.

3. What is the meaning of the theory that the soul sleeps till the judgment?

It sprang from a materialistic view, which cannot separate man from his bodily organisation. The great lesson of the intermediate state is that man can exist in spirit: the bodily investiture figuratively given to the departed in scripture cannot be with any good result investigated.

4. How is this to be refuted?

By its own intrinsic inconsistency: if the soul sleeps, it is in existence. But it is opposed by the whole tenour of scripture, which speaks of *the spirits of just men made perfect;* and links being *absent from the body* and being ***at home with the Lord.***

Heb. xii. 23.
2 Cor. v. 8.

5. What is the dogma of purgatory in relation to this?

Very early traces are found in the fathers of the general teaching that departed Christians finish their discipline of sanctification *so as by fire:* perverting that text and some others. But mediæval scholasticism divided the intermediate region into many mansions: a LIMBUS for the ancient saints; for children unbaptised; for the heathen; and for imperfect Christians, the great majority. This last is the dogma proper: which, with its concomitants of masses and prayers for the dead, and indulgences, has no warrant of scripture.

1 Cor. iii. 15.

6. How is the theory of intermediate probation maintained by its advocates?

This goes much further than the dogma of purgatory, which is a severe pathway to heaven. This theory supposes that the gospel is still preached in the other world, to be accepted or rejected: in fact, that at the final judgment each will receive the things done in the separate spirit as well as *the things done in the body.*

2 Cor. v. 10.

7. In what light is this placed by the New Testament?

Not merely does it give no text for this hope; it precludes it. Undoubtedly the Lord seems to encourage it in two passages: in the *Son, remember!* of His parable, and in the *When saw we Thee?* of His description of the judgment. But in the former the *great gulf* is fixed, and in the latter the accepted who had been ignorant of Him were the inhabitants of earth in time.

Luke xvi. 25.
Matt. xxv. 37.
Luke xvi. 26.

8. What is our safeguard?

To hold fast and preach the gospel of *the day of salvation;* and to leave the dead, without theorising about them or the mysteries of their destiny, to their Lord and ours.

2 Cor. vi. 2.

CHAPTER II.

The Second Coming of Christ: Resurrection and Judgment.

I.

The Second Coming.

§ 1. Scripture.

1. How many advents of Christ are spoken of?

Two only. Though the phrase "Second coming" does not occur, the return of Jesus is always referred to as an event unique and final: precisely as His first coming was referred to in the Old Testament.

2. How does the New Testament describe it?

By a variety of terms, which may be classed as terms of mission and coming, manifestation and presence, each of them giving it a distinct character; and also by the results that follow, as it is the day of the Lord issuing in the resurrection of all and the general judgment.

3. What do the terms of mission teach?

(1) That the return of our Lord, *Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things*, is the appointed end of His mediatorial work of subordination: *that He may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus.* (2) This must interpret the words in which His coming is spoken of: *I come again. This Jesus, which was received up from you into heaven shall so come. Behold, He cometh with the clouds.*

Acts iii. 21, 20.

John xiv. 3. Acts i. 11. Rev. i. 7.

4. In what sense will it be a manifestation?

First, He will be no longer in the invisible world: *When Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested.* Hence

Col. iii. 4.

it is the παρουσία, which is, strictly speaking, the presence with His people that follows His coming. Secondly, His second coming in glory is thus distinguished from the first in humiliation: we look for the *appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.*

Titus ii. 13.

5. What is the emphasis of His day?

It refers to the set time of the Lord's coming, as *the day of the Lord;* and also indicates, according to scriptural usage, a supreme manifestation of His person and consummation of His work. *The day of the Lord* is used in the Old Testament to signify any great display of Jehovah's power, whether in mercy or in judgment; and *the day of Jesus Christ*, the New-Testament Jehovah, signifies everywhere the final demonstration both of His love and of His wrath: in the judgment and in the consummation of all things.

1 Thess. v. 2. Zeph. i. 14; iii. 16. Phil. i. 6.

6. Are all these terms limited to one external and future event?

Both "coming" and "manifestation" are sometimes used to describe the Lord's presence by His Spirit in His church and the hearts of His people: *I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him. We will come unto him. I will not leave you desolate: I come unto you. It pleased God . . . to reveal His Son in me.* But in every such case there is something to indicate that it is personal and internal.

John xiv. 21, 23, 18. Gal. i. 15, 16.

§ 2. Historical.

1. What errors have arisen as to the Lord's second coming?

Two opposite classes: each having a variety of forms. First, it has been unduly spiritualised, as if all was fulfilled in His spiritual coming at Pentecost or the destruction of Judaism. Secondly, it has been unduly carnalised, mainly by those who have taught the literal reign of a thousand years.

2. How may we meet the former class of interpreters?

By pointing to the emphasis with which the New Testament speaks of the definite events which will precede the Lord's coming: it has *its own times*, as the con-

1 Tim. vi. 15.

summation of many lesser *times or seasons.* Nothing is plainer than that it marks one determinate historical event. Acts i. 7.

3. What is the nature of the other, and more important, error?

It is called, generally, Millenarianism, from the "thousand years" of Christ's supposed visible reign: Chiliasm being the Greek form of the same word. More particularly it is Pre-millenarianism: the PRE signifying that Christ's second advent and the first resurrection are before the millennium, and, that a third advent and a second resurrection will follow it.

4. Did the early Christian ages embrace this view?

(1) The Judaising Christians brought the notion to the interpretation of prophecy; (2) it was largely held by many individual fathers; (3) it was strenuously opposed by the Alexandrian divines; (4) it did not appear in the Three Creeds, the note of which is one personal coming at the end of all; (5) after the Nicene Council it gradually disappeared, at least for a season, the temporal prosperity of the church helping this.

5. What was the subsequent history of the doctrine?

At the end of the first Christian millennium, Christendom was almost universally disturbed by an expectation of the end of the world: showing how deeply rooted was the millenarian hope. After the reformation, the Anabaptists in Germany wildly perverted this idea, as the fanatics of the Commonwealth did in England. The confessions of the seventeenth century without exception condemned it. And it may be said that, as it was a note of Judaising in early times, so in the mediæval church it was a badge of fanaticism.

6. But has it not acquired greater theological importance in later times?

It has, in the present century, entered with more or less distinctness into the teaching of many communions; and has become almost the distinguishing tenet of a few.

7. With what effect?

Its adherents have often made it a watchword of exclusiveness: elevating into an article of faith the habitual expectation of the Lord's appearance to reign on the earth. It has given

rise to a carnal interpretation of the prophecies, especially those of the Old Testament, thus disturbing the steady faith of Christians in the Lord's one future coming to judgment. It has put a forced construction on the plain chronological series of events which are predicted as preparing for the advent. And it has tended to impair, as a consequence, the missionary activity of the churches which have embraced its tenets.

8. What is that chronological series?

We are taught, positively, that we shall not *know times or seasons which the Father hath set within His own authority.* Negatively, we are instructed :

Acts i. 7.

(1) That *this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations ; and then shall the end come*, but not till then.

Matt. xxiv. 14.

(2) That the Jewish people will be converted after the ingathering of the heathen, and be a great revival of Christianity : it is the MYSTERY, *that a hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.*

Rom. xi. 25. Rom. xi. 15.

(3) That this revival of Christendom, *life from the dead*, will be a universal millennial diffusion of the gospel, in comparison of which the previous state of the Christian world may be figuratively described as death.

(4) That a final apostasy, the last appearance of the spirit of antichrist in the person of one yet unknown antichrist, must precede the coming of the Lord.

2 Thess. i. 8.

9. But are there not some passages which strongly plead for a pre-millennial advent?

There are some : there is one especially in the Apocalypse which, if interpreted literally, and not compared with other scriptures, would be decisive.

Rev. xx.

10. How is that passage to be interpreted?

In harmony (1) with the symbolical character of the whole book ; (2) with the doctrine of our Lord Himself, Who, in one and the same passage, speaks of a spiritual and of a physical resurrection ; (3) with the current of the entire New Testament, which speaks of one coming of the Saviour for the resurrection and judgment of men and the redemption of His people.

John v. 28, 29.

II.

The Resurrection.

1. In what way is the resurrection treated in the New Testament?

It is one of the things which are made subjects of special revelation; both our Lord and His apostles introduce it as a new and final mystery. As a mystery: therefore, first, it had been partially made known; and, secondly, it was fully and, so far as the human mind can now receive it, perfectly revealed.

2. But was it not revealed in the Old Testament?

Many passages are found which in the light of the New declare the doctrine; and some which are shown to have contained preintimations of it: such as that with which Jesus rebuked the Sadducees. But Daniel has more than a germ: *Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.*

Isa. xxvi. 19. Hosea xiii. 14. Luke xx. 37, 38. Dan. xii. 2.

3. What was the current opinion in our Lord's age?

The Pharisees and the Sadducees were divided on this as on other subjects: the former were appealed to by the apostle Paul as believers in the resurrection. And Martha expressed in the most confident manner an explicit faith.

Acts xxiii. 6–8. John xi. 24.

4. How is it stamped [illegible] new revelation?

The Redeemer introduced it as a SPECIAL WONDER of His teaching; and St. Paul as a MYSTERY: both the marvel and the mystery referring to the fuller revelations both of the Master and of His servant.

John v. 28, 29. 1 Cor. xv. 51.

5. What are the specific elements of the Christian doctrine?

Its connection with the Person and work of Christ; with the universal judgment; and with the perfect glorification of the whole man in Christ.

1. Christ and the Resurrection.

1. How is this connection viewed?

The resurrection is a fruit of the Redeemer's atonement;

an act of His mediatorial authority ; and specially a privilege of union with Himself.

2. What is its relation to the atonement?

By His death the Redeemer ransomed the whole nature of man. Death ruled over Him as the representative of human sin ; when He rose it was proved that *death no more hath dominion over Him* (κυριεύει), but *that He might be Lord both of the dead and the living* (κυριεύσῃ). He *abolished death* at all points.

Rom. vi. 9. Rom. xiv. 9. 2 Tim. i. 10.

3. And what to His mediatorial authority?

(1) Of His Divine-human Person He said : *All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth.* The raising of the dead is one exercise of that power : *All that are in the tombs shall hear His voice.*

Matt. xxviii. 18. John v. 28.

(2) The resurrection of all men is bound up with the final judgment, the last display of His authority : *Because he is the Son of man* He raiseth men to judge them.

John v. 27.

(3) But this resurrection is not to be limited to the body : *He quickeneth whom He will.*

John v. 21.

(4) On the evening of the day of His own resurrection our Lord assumed His power. *He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost :* the same word, ἐνεφύσησε, which records the first gift of life to man Whatever other meaning these words have, they mean the impartation of the resurrection life.

John xx. 22. Gen. ii. 7.

(5) St. Paul uses the most emphatic word possible to express the mediatorial authority exerted in the resurrection : *According to the working whereby He is able even to subject all things unto Himself* (ὑποτάξαι).

Phil. iii. 21.

4. And what is its special relation to union with Himself?

The strain of New Testament teaching makes this very prominent. As the eternal Son *hath life in Himself*, so the incarnate Son says, *I am the resurrection and the life*, to man. This is the most emphatic instance of the I AM. By His union with our race mankind has received the virtue of the general resurrection.

John v. 26. John xi. 25, 26.

5. How is this more particularly related to His people?

Jesus is the source, the pledge and the pattern of their resurrection.

6. In what sense is He its source?

The union of believers with their Head by faith makes His resurrection theirs: they know now and shall hereafter know *the power of His resurrection.* Phil. iii. 10.

7. In what sense is He the pledge of this?

It is enough to hear, *Because I live ye shall live also.* The Holy Spirit is the universal pledge; and St. Paul bids us remember that our mortal bodies shall be quickened *because of His Spirit that dwelleth in you.* Christ is *the Firstfruits of them that are asleep;* and we have *the firstfruits of the Spirit*: the word ἀπαρχή is expressly used of both. John xiv. 19. Rom. viii. 11. 1 Cor. xv. 20. Rom. viii. 23.

8. And in what sense the pattern?

(1) Our Lord *saw no corruption*, either of body or of spirit: that marks a limitation; He is not at all points the pattern either of our spiritual resurrection or of our physical. (2) But as He is the exemplar of our perfect spiritual life, so is He the exemplar of our bodily glorification: we are *foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son; Who shall fashion anew the body of* OUR *humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of* HIS *glory.* Acts xiii. 37. Rom. viii. 29. Phil. iii. 21.

§ 2. The Resurrection of Man.

1. What are the leading ideas in the doctrine?

They are three: the rising again of man in his integrity; the resurrection of the flesh in order to glorification; and the raising of the dead generally. All these are used in their several relations.

2. How is the resurrection of the flesh referred to?

Only as the raising by Divine power of a spiritual body, the organ of the spirit becoming a soul again.

3. What terms are used for the change?

(1) As to the Divine operation, it is called a re-construct ing change: *Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation.* (2) As to the effect, it is such a change as has no resemblance on earth, though St. Paul rebukes unbelief by analogies: the result is the appearing of the spirit in a body of *incorruption* and of *immortality*, which is no longer *natural*, as related to sensible things, but *spiritual.*

Phil. iii. 21.
1 Cor. xv. 53, 44.

4. Is the same term used for change without death?

No: one quite different. *We shall be changed:* that is, the last generation, alive at the Lord's coming, will not undergo a fashioning anew, but such a transformation as the Lord underwent at the mount. But the result will be the same; for the dead will be fashioned anew in order to *be conformed to the body of His glory.*

1 Cor. xv. 52.
Matt. xvii. 2.
Phil. iii. 21.

5. Does the raising of the dead introduce another idea?

It lays the emphasis rather upon the return of the whole personality to life; and this is the general strain of scripture. Of this our Lord's one cardinal text is the example: *Now that the dead are raised. For all live unto Him.*

Luke xx. 37, 38.

6. What light is shed on the nature of the resurrection body?

None: beyond this, that it will be, (1) negatively, mortal no longer; and (2) positively, spiritual, the organ of the spirit in a spiritual world.

§ 3. Historical.

1. What have been the expectations of mankind generally?

Outside of revelation there is no evidence that the resurrection was ever a clearly defined anticipation among men: though the treatment of the bodies of the dead, especially among the ancient Egyptians, is full of suggestion.

2. Did later Judaism entertain this faith?

The apocryphal books prove that it was accepted; and the New Testament assumes a general belief among the Jews.

3. How did speculation in the early church take shape?

The Gnostic sects asserted that *the resurrection is past already:* one portion of the early church, in stern opposition to them, emphasised the literal rising of the flesh, and another adhered to the more spiritual view. The early creeds were divided between "the resurrection OF THE FLESH" and "the resurrection OF THE BODY." 2 Tim. ii. 18.

4. What was the current of mediæval thought?

The majority of the schoolmen adopted the most literal interpretation: the precise resurrection of the last edition of the body as committed to the grave. Their minor subtleties were endless; one of them, however, having had a long vitality, that all the saints will rise after the model of our Saviour's perfect manhood, as in the thirtieth year.

5. On what theory were the reformation formulas constructed?

With a clearer reconciliation of the literal and spiritual elements of the doctrine than had been attained before. The Lutherans, however, connected with it their fundamental idea of the impartation through the eucharist of the glorified corporeity of our Lord: His spiritual body having a mystical relation both to the intermediate body and to that of the resurrection.

6. What have been the more modern speculations?

Two points have been made the centres of theorising.

(1) The supposed necessity that the body, dissolved in the earth, should be reconstructed, has led to much straining of exposition and disregard of physical facts.

(2) The theory of a germ retained in the general dissolution has developed in various ways: that germ has been supposed to be dormant till the resurrection, or to be half glorified in the ethereal body of the intermediate state.

7. What may be said of these speculations?

That they are as needless as they are useless: the man, common to soul and body, will be the same; but, as his spiritual life is a new creation, being the Son of God within him, so his body will be a new creation also.

8. What may be said [illegible] to the whole subject?

All may be summed up in the one great lesson, thrice recorded, of our Lord concerning it.

(1) He distinguishes between *the sons of this world*, and *the sons of the resurrection*, who are *the sons of God:* even as St. Paul speaks of his own expectation of *the resurrection from the dead*, from among the rest of the dead who will rise.

Luke xx. 34, 36. Phil. iii. 11.

(2) He says that they are *equal unto the angels:* with spiritual bodies of which we have now no conception.

Luke xx. 36.

(3) He proves that *the dead are raised* by shewing that the Lord is *not the God of the dead but of the living;* and that, as *He is the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*,—of each patriarch distinctly,—each of them in his personal integrity is already counted as having risen.

Luke xx. 37, 38.

(4) Hence, there is an identity of the persons, but a difference of the bodies as great as the difference of *this world* and *that world.*

Luke xx. 34, 35.

III.

The Judgment.

§ 1. The Judge.

1. What is the final teaching of scripture [illegible] to the Judge?

(1) That the Father *hath given all judgment unto the Son*, or the Holy Trinity to the God-man; (2) while still it remains true that God is *the Judge of all.* (3) The reconciliation of these is that the Son of man, the Judge, is the eternal Son of God, Who alone could be capable of such [illegible] commission.

John v. 22. Heb. xii. 23.

2. Has the Lord's human nature [illegible] special relation to this office?

The Lord indicates this by adding, *Because He is the Son of man.* It is not so much, however, because of His special human tenderness, as because the destinies of men [illegible] entirely committed to His hands.

John v. 27.

3. What is the special relation of the judgment to the Lord's own person?

(1) He Himself again connects with it, *That all may honour the Son:* this being His own self-assertion; and in harmony with His other solitary reference to the glory of His royal majesty, *The Son of man shall come in His glory* and shall *sit on the throne of His glory. Then shall the King say!* John v. 23. Matt. xxv. 31, 34.

(2) Hence the abundant descriptions of the dread circumstantials of the judgment: which are introduced to elevate our thoughts and impress them; and also to depict and glorify the majesty of the Judge.

4. What is its relation to His redeeming work?

(1) The universal judgment will be the vindication of the atonement: we read of *the wrath of* THE LAMB. The mediation of our Lord has given a new character to sin and a new terror to its condemnation. Rev. vi. 16. Heb. x. 26.

(2) It will display the righteousness of the moral government of the world, which has from the beginning of human sin been conducted on the redemption as its basis.

(3) It will be the final expression of its results. He will *appear a second time apart from sin*, without atonement for the rejected, for *them that wait for Him unto salvation.* Heb. ix. 28.

5. What is the deep significance of the second point?

The multitudes of mankind have been dealt with as redeemed throughout all their history; this has been the secret of the Spirit's work outside of revelation as well as within it; and they will be judged with reference to that government. The only time that our Lord calls Himself *the Son of man* who comes *in His glory*, is when He speaks of His being the Judge of *all the nations.* St. Paul says that *the secrets* of men—as such—will be judged *according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ.* But we cannot penetrate beyond. The same apostle, with one aspect of the same subject in his mind, cries, and we should humbly join him: *O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past tracing out.* Matt. xxv. 31, 32. Rom. ii. 16. Rom. xi. 33.

§ 2. The Judged.

1. What is the testimony as to the extent of the judgment?

Rom. ii. 16. Acts xvii, 31. Rom. xiv. 10. Matt. xxv. 32. Rev. xx. 12.

That there will be one gathering *of men*, of *all men*, of *the world:* of *all nations*, of *the earth*, the *quick and the dead*, of *small and great:* the first and last and only congregation of mankind.

2. What testimony is given to its individuality?

In the Old Testament we read, *God will bring thee into judgment*; in the New, *Who will render to every man according to his deeds.* The conscience, which is the individual internal judgment that NOW IS, confirms this testimony to the universal external judgment that WILL BE.

Eccles. xi. 9. Rom. ii. 6.

3. But are the redeemed and saved to be judged?

(1) It may be said that the believer undergoes his ordeal in the present life; that he judges himself that he may not be judged; that he does not *come into judgment, but hath passed from death unto life;* that at the great day he will only be *made manifest.* Our common thought is that the saints receive their verdict when they enter the Lord's presence in death; and that they rather *judge the world* with Christ than are judged by Him.

John v. 24. 2 Cor. v. 10. 1 Cor. vi. 2.

(2) But the most emphatic appeals to a future judgment are addressed to believers; and all that has been said must be made consistent with the reality of their ordeal. In fact, the sacred mystery of the resurrection will be this, that, not only shall we rise again, but all the actions of our life rise again with us.

4. How is any judgment of Christians consistent with their salvation?

Judgment in their case means separation. And much of that separation is represented as between true and false Christians. Moreover, so far as judgment means requital of the past, it will be in their case the allotment of their appropriate sphere, and the due reward of their good works.

§ 3. The Principles by which Judgment will be Conducted.

1. What principles will guide the final judgment?

(1) Generally, and with reference to the Judge, it **must**

always be remembered that *the Judge of all the earth* will *do right:* the judgment will be the final manifestation of that law which is *holy, and just and good.* In the light of this truth only can we approach the awful mysteries of the judgment-seat. Gen. xviii. 25. Rom. vii. 12.

(2) But, particularly, and as to the judged, we are taught that judgment will be regulated by certain fixed principles.

2. In what sense will the measure of privilege be a test?

Nothing is more clearly revealed than that the judgment will take account of the degree of light and opportunity given in probation. For some it will be *more tolerable* than for others. Matt. xi. 24.

3. How are faith and works connected with the final judgment?

This double test will be applied to Christians in particular:

(1) *The work of faith* unites them: the whole character and life are made up of these as cause and effect. 1 Thess. i. 3.

(2) They must be viewed separately. On the one hand, the final question will be concerning faith in Jesus or rejection of Him. But, on the other, good works will be evidence of the reality of faith, and evil works of the reality of unbelief. Jas. ii. 18. Matt. xii. 37.

4. But do not good works enter very largely into every fore-announcement?

They do appear prominent in both Testaments: so prominent that, however much it heightens the wonder of the doctrine, we must believe that the Judge will not only *render to each man according as his* WORK *is,* but also to all *according to their* WORKS. Rev. xxii. 12. Rev. xx. 12.

5. What will be the self-revelation of the judgment?

That final conviction which will cause all the condemned of God to condemn themselves; and give to the accepted *boldness in the day of judgment.* 1 John iv. 17.

6. How is condemnation related to judgment?

Judgment (κρίσις) means separation proceeding by test of character; condemnation (κατάκρισις), separation to punishment. As condemnation is universal, and all are separated to

condemnation before they are separated to life, the two words have to a great extent the same meaning.

7. What is the final condemnation?

It is the sentence, *Depart from Me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels.* And this is explained by the Judge Himself: *These shall go away into eternal punishment.*

Matt. xxv. 41.
Matt. xxv. 46.

8. How is this sentence to be analysed?

(1) Its stress is on the severance from the Lord; the punishment of sin is, like sin itself, separation from God.

(2) But the conscious suffering is added: expressed by a fearful figure which must not be explained away.

(3) Its eternal continuance is made emphatic: it is eternal as the life of the righteous is, and it is shared with the devil and his angels, for whom there is no redemption.

9. In what sense will the final judgment be confirmation of the past?

Both as to the saved and the lost the last decree will be a sentence already expected: the latter have *a certain fearful expectation of judgment*, and the former already *hath eternal life*, and *is not judged.* Though the resurrection is not past already, the judgment in a certain sense is.

Heb. x. 27.
John iii. 36, 18.

§ 4. Historical: Controversy.

1. Has the final judgment appeared in the religions of mankind?

In some form almost universally; but without any reference to a great determinate period.

2. What was the later Jewish faith?

It was indeterminate: save that the Messiah was expected to come as a judge to vindicate His own people and condemn the nations outside of Judaism.

3. How has Christian opinion varied?

The deep general consent of the church has been given to

the doctrine already laid down. But the germs of two opposite errors early appeared ; and also tendencies to adopt mediating theories of alleviation.

4. What are the opposite errors ?

They are called in modern language Universalism and Annihilationism.

Universalism and Annihilationism.

5. How do they deal with the results of the general judgment ?

(1) The former denies that there will be an ETERNAL separation of good and evil : hence the essential idea of judgment is taken away ; for all souls are to be restored.

(2) The latter denies that there will be a SEPARATION of two permanent classes ; for the condemnation is supposed to be sooner or later the loss of existence.

(3) They have, however, certain common principles, and points in which they essentially differ.

6. What principles are common to these two opinions ?

They alike argue (1) for the removal of all evil from the universe ; (2) for the impossibility of reconciling unceasing punishment with the Divine perfections ; (3) that the sin of a finite creature cannot be punished infinitely ; (4) that the design of redemption is to destroy the works of the devil and abolish all the effects of sin.

7. Do they really agree on all these points ?

Yes : but they reach the same conclusion from different premises ; and the comparison of these tends at once to explain the theories and to refute them.

8. How may we answer their common demand that evil must be extinguished ?

While the two doctrines certainly provide for the abolition of evil, and thus give a certain relief to the mind, neither of them explains away the fact that evil has existed. It is at least as easy to accept the continuance of evil as its beginning : there is no argument against either.

9. What can be said as to their second common principle?

(1) This plausible argument against the doctrine of scripture is inconsistently urged by the annihilationist, since he does make the punishment eternal in the most absolute sense; and by the restorationist, since he allows that the threatening of endless doom is used to prevent that doom itself.

(2) More directly, it must be remembered that the entire scheme of probation is based upon the eternal issues of time; and that all we know of the Divine dealings with man in this life teaches that the results of evil swell into endless disproportion to the apparent cause.

10. But they appeal to the Divine attributes against the permanence of suffering?

(1) The love and power of God are relied on by both to put an end to the causes of suffering; but the argument loses all its power in the presence of the fact that sorrow has been permitted to enter.

(2) The attributes of God are best explained and best vindicated by Himself: He never in revelation appeals to either His love or His power as demanding the cessation of evil and suffering.

11. Is this true? Do not many sayings declare that the end of the atonement is the abolition of evil?

Not one passage can be quoted which fairly bears that construction.

(1) The design of redemption is to *put away sin*, to *destroy the works of the devil*, and that *the world should be saved through Him.* But we see that the words mean, when examined in their context, to put away in a Levitical sense by atonement, and to destroy in the sense of overturning the power of Satan.

Heb. ix. 26.
1 John iii. 8.
John iii. 17.

(2) The result is *that God may be all in all:* God without a mediator in all the saved, of whom alone the chapter speaks. The Mediator will have *put down*, or *abolished*, *all rule and all authority and power:* the term here used is inconsistent with simple destruction, on the one hand, and with the universal saving complacency of God, on the other.

1 Cor. xv. 28.
1 Cor. xv. 24.

(3) Again, it is said concerning the design and the issue, that Christ's work is the reconciling by God of *all things unto Himself*, or *to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth.* Heaven and earth are brought into harmony again : not by the salvation of evil spirits, for *not of angels doth He take hold*, and He is not their head. Peace is reestablished in the universe. Col. i. 20. Eph. i. 10. Heb. ii. 16.

12. Where do the theories essentially differ?

(1) As to the design of retributive judgment; as to the nature of probation ; as to the natural immortality of man ; and especially as to the meaning of the terms wrath, life, death, destruction. (2) Their mutual differences are the furtherance of the truth which is opposed to both.

13. How do they differ as to retributive judgment?

One theory says that all punishment is a vindication of God's law, even to the destruction of the sinning soul ; the other says that all punishment is chastisement or discipline for final salvation. But punishment (κόλασις) is always distinguished from chastisement (παιδεία) ; and both terms require the existence of the subject that feels them.

14. How as to the nature of probation ?

The one affirms that the end of the probation is the failure of God, who puts out of being that which is reprobate; the other denies the essence of probation, by introducing an almighty power that rescues the reprobate. But the solemn word is that *whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap.* Gal. vi. 7.

15. **How as to natural immortality?**

They fundamentally differ ; and the truth is in neither.

(1) The annihilationists assert that man *was made a living soul* only; and that Christ came that believers in Him might have immortality. But man was made *in the image of God* as well as a living soul ; and Christ *came to seek and to save that which was lost*, and not to give them another human nature. 1 Cor. xv. 45. Gen. ii. 7. Gen. i. 27. Luke xix. 10.

(2) The universalists imply, whether they assert it or not,

that immortality is the gift from God to all His intelligent creatures of life in Him, and that in some way it must be preserved to them for ever: forgetting that immortality is not life IN GOD necessarily. But this leads to the next very important question, as to the meaning of the leading terms.

16. And what is their difference here?

(1) One system of doctrine confounds life with existence and death with annihilation; whereas the scripture carefully distinguishes these: the existing man *hath the life* or *hath not the life* just as he *hath the Son* or *hath not the Son of God*. It confounds destruction, or the being lost, with annihilation; whereas the strongest word ever used is applied to a living soul who *was lost and is found* (ἀπολωλὼς ἦν).

1 John v. 12.

Luke xv. 32.

(2) The other system deals with the same terms in a way equally unscriptural. It denies the awful meaning both of death and destruction, and the blessed peculiarity of life and salvation. As the parable of the prodigal son refutes the theory that being lost is being put out of being, so the dark word concerning Judas refutes the notion that there is no destruction: he was *the son of perdition* (ἀπωλείας), and of him it was said, *Good were it for that man if he had not been born.*

John xvii. 12.

Mark xiv. 21.

Mitigating Hypotheses.

17. What are the intermediate theories?

Methods of interpreting the judgment which have aimed to soften the harshness of what St. Paul calls *the fear of the Lord*. Some of them have been unscriptural, and some have a certain measure of scriptural support.

2 Cor. v. 11.

18. Of which may the former be said?

(1) Of those which in every age have speculated as to a final economy of grace superseding the atonement, and really resting on the intercession of Christ apart from His redeeming passion. Such a separation has no warrant.

(2) Of those which press too far the distinction between the judgment of loss (damni, whence the term damnation), and the judgment of penal suffering: making the sentence of

exclusion from God's presence one to which the lost submit in despair.

(3) Of those which divide human nature in the endurance of the sentence: some regarding the spirit as lost, and the sufferer reduced to a merely animal existence; some supposing that the body will be suppressed, and the spirit therefore endure only disembodied sufferings.

(4) Of those which regard the intermediate state as a sphere of such possibilities of merciful discipline as would really transfer to it the true, or at least the most abundant reign of grace.

19. Of which may the latter be said?

Of all those which dwell on the *few stripes* and the *many stripes;* on the Divine consideration of the opportunities men have had; on the Saviour's testimony concerning His imputation of righteousness to faith which never knew Him; on the special emphasis of the *sin unto death;* on the assurance that all rebellion will be suppressed throughout the universe; and, above all, on the eternal truth which all must accept, that the Saviour of men will let none perish who can be saved.

Luke xii. 47, 48. Matt. xxv 40. 1 Cor. xv. 25. 1 John v. 16.

Chapter III.

The Consummation or End of all Things.

1. In what sense must we use this term?

There are three consummations in scripture: the end of the preparation of the earth for man; the end of the preparation for Christ; and the end of all things. Each of these ends is a new beginning: the τέλος or consummation of one scheme is the ἀρχή or origination of another.

2. What reaches its consummation or end with the judgment?

The mediatorial kingdom and the saving purpose of the Holy Trinity; the creation which becomes a new heaven and earth; the perfected church of the saints glorified.

3. How are all these embraced in the consummation?

Because so far as the history of mankind is concerned
Rom. xi. 36. these are all one in the eternal purpose of God: *For of Him, and through Him, and unto Him are all things.*

§ 2. The Saving Purpose.

1. How may it be said that the purpose of salvation will be attained?

(1) Because the uniform testimony of scripture confirms the first principle of faith in God: that what is a Divine purpose must be accomplished. And (2) the work of Christ is always spoken of as an eternal design accomplished in time.

2. Is not the failure to save all men a defeat of that design?

Silence is the best answer here. But it may be said that man, as a race, is saved.

3. How is this related to the kingdom of Christ?

The salvation of the human race is connected with the kingdom in two ways; (1) as that is the mediatorial authority

of Christ to put down all opposing powers; and (*2*) as it is the dominion of Christ over the recovered race. In both these senses its consummation will be its end: *When he shall deliver up the kingdom to the God and Father.* 1 Cor. xv. 24.

4. But is not this the subjection of the Son also?

The Son is incarnate, and, as the incarnate mediatorial Ruler, *shall be subjected to Him that did subject all things unto Him:* that is, shall officially present the finished redemption, while still eternally the subordinate yet coequal Son: *that God may be all in all.* 1 Cor. xv. 28.

§ 2. The New Heaven and Earth.

1. In what sense is this a consummation?

The heaven and earth that now is, having served its purpose, will be destroyed: that is, will be changed into a new sphere, adapted to the eternal destinies of mankind. *The elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up.* This shall be *by reason of* the *presence of the day of God*; and *We look for new heavens and a new earth.* 2 Peter iii. 10—13.

2. What will be the link between the old and the new?

The same as between the carnal and the regenerate spirit, the natural and the spiritual body. The wonderful works of man on the face of the earth will perish; the earth itself, as God's work, will be the same, but undergo a transforming change such as is included in the Lord's words: *in the regeneration. Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth,* must be interpreted in harmony with this. Matt. xix. 28. Isa. lxv. 17.

3. Is this doctrine revealed with sufficient clearness to be thus positively spoken of?

It is declared in both testaments; and very explicitly: not as matter of prophecy only, but for practical purposes. Isa. lxv. 17—25.

4. What purposes are these?

To teach us that the creation of God has a developing history apart from man; that this earth, however, and the

heavens over it, will share man's destiny; that the physical universe is bound up with the Divine designs; and that the
2 Peter iii. 13. inhabitants of the present world should so live as to prepare for the *new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*

5. How does this translation by fire comport with science?

As to the fact of the agency of fire, science is more than in accord. But as to the glorification of nature—its being
Rom. viii. 21. *delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God*—it has nothing to say. A higher agent than material fire will accomplish that.

§ 3. The Perfecting of the Church.

1. How is the consummation viewed in regard to the race?

The saved are the *people* of God; *the bride, the wife of*
Rev. xxi. 2, 3, 9. *the Lamb;* one with Christ and through Him
John xvii. 21. with the Holy Trinity, *perfect in one* for ever: *the*
Eph. i. 23. *fulness of Him that filleth all in all.* This is the end to which the gradual gathering of the church of all generations has tended.

2. Why is this called the consummation of the race?

Because it is the end of the mediatorial history of mankind. That began in Paradise; and it ends there. *The nations*
Rev. xxi. 24,10. *shall walk by the light* of the temple, which is the
Rev. xxii. 14,15. *holy city Jerusalem,* and have *right to come to the*
Rev. xxi. 8. *tree of life.* The unsaved of mankind are WITHOUT,
Phil. iii. 19. in the SECOND DEATH *Whose end is destruction:* that is their end, but it does not enter into the consummation as we view it.

3. Does not the consummation include the destinies of the individual saints?

Only as they are members of the one corporate body. But
John xvii. 21. the perfection of all will be the perfection of each.

4. What are more particularly the characteristics of the
1 Cor. vi. 17. **eternal state of the blessed?**

(1) Their union with God: *that they also may be one in Us,* which is the highest aspiration of religion. *He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit:* this faintly expresses what

the sanctified and perfected soul is capable of enjoying in perfect fellowship with the Holy Trinity.

(2) The highest perfection of created nature: released from every hindrance and restraint, the development of all the capacities of their being will go on in the broad way, narrow no longer, to infinity. 1 Cor. xiii. 8—10.

(3) Everlasting worship and service: wherein the gratitude of the redeemed will find its eternal sphere for the manifestation of that love to God and His creatures in Him which is the final perfection of all religion, whether on earth or in heaven: ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε πίπτει LOVE NEVER FAILETH. 1 Cor. xiii.

TO HIM BE THE GLORY FOR EVER. AMEN.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.
A17769

BT1031 .P6
Pope, William Burt, 1822-1903.
A higher catechism of theology.

Div Page. 8

BT
1031
P6
Pope, William Burt, 1822-1903.
A higher catechism of theology. New York, Phillips & Hunt [18--]
vi, 389p. 21cm.

Questions and answers.

1. Catechisms. I. Title.

CCSC/mmb

A17269

A17269